New Essays

VOLUME 2

GREENWOOD

RADICAL PERIODICALS IN THE UNITED STATES

RADICAL PERIODICALS IN THE UNITED STATES

FIRST SERIES 1888-1960

Alternative (1948-1951)
Amerasia (1937-1947)
American Appeal (1920-1927)
American Socialist (1914-1917)
American Spectator (1932-1937)
Black & White (1939-1940)
Blast (1916-1917)
China Today (1934-1942)
Class Struggle (1917-1919)
Class Struggle (1931-1937)
Clipper (1940-1941)
Common Sense (1932-1946)
Communist (1919-1921)
Communist International (1919-1940)
Conscientious Objector (1939-1946)
Dialectics (1937-1939)
Enquiry (1942-1945)
Equal Justice (1926-1942)
Forerunner (1909-1916)
Good Morning (1919-1921)
Industrial Pioneer (1921-1926)
Industrial Unionist (1932-1950)
International Class Struggle (1936-1937)
International Review (1936-1939)
International Socialist Review (1900-1918)
International Socialist Review (1940-1963)
Labor Action (1940-1958)
Labor Age (1913-1933)
Labor Bulletin (1936-1938)
Marxist Quarterly (1937)
Militant (1928-1934)
Modern Quarterly (1923-1940)
Modern Review (1947-1950)
Modern Socialism (1941-1942)
Monthly Review (1934-1935)
Monthly Review (1949-1960)
Mother Earth Bulletin (1906-1918)
Nationalist (1889-1891)
New Foundations (1947-1954)
New International (1934-1958)
New Militant (1934-1936)
New Nation (1891-1894)
New Review (1913-1916)
New Trends (1945-1946)
New World Review (1932-1960)
One Big Union Monthly (1919-1938)
Pacifica Views (1943-1947)
Party Organizer (1927-1938)
Politics (1944-1949)
Radical Review (1917-1919)
Rebel (1895-1896)
Retort (1942-1951)
Revolutionary Age (1918-1919)
Revolutionary Age (1929-1932)
Socialist Appeal (1934-1937)
Socialist Review (1932-1940)

Spanish Revolution (1936-1938)
Spanish Revolution (1936-1937)
Student Advocate (1936-1938)
Student Review (1931-1935)
U.S. Week (1941-1942)
Weekly Review (1936-1943)
Workers Age (1932-1941)
Workers' Council (1921)
Workers' League for a Revolutionary Party, Bulletin (1937-1950)
World Survey (1941-1942)
Young Worker (1922-1936)

SECOND SERIES 1881-1961

Alarm (1884-1889)
American Fabian (1895-1900)
Catholic Worker (1933-1961)
Challenge (1938-1939)
Challenge! YPSL (1943-1946)
Champion Labor Monthly (1936-1938)
Clarity (1940-1943)
Comrade (1901-1905)
Debs Magazine (1921-1923)
Dr. Robinson's Voice in the Wilderness (1917-1920)
Equality (1939-1940)
Freedom (1933-1934)
Hour (1939-1943)
Industrial Democracy (1932-1938)
Industrial Union Bulletin (1907-1909)
Industrial Unionist (1925-1926)
Industrial Worker (1909-1913)
Labor Power (1939-1941)
League for Industrial Democracy (1922-1932)
Liberty (1881-1908)
Man! (1933-1940)
Marxian (1921)
Marxist (1925-1927)
Marxist Review (1937-1940)
National Issues (1939)
New Day (1920-1922)
New Essays (1934-1943)
New Justice (1919-1920)
New Student (1922-1929)
New York Communist (1919)
Party Builder (1912-1914)
Road to Communism (1934-1935)
Road to Freedom (1924-1932)
Socialist (1919)
Socialist Party (1904-1913)
Socialist Spirit (1901-1903)
Syndicalist (1910-1913)
Upton Sinclair's (1918-1919)
Vanguard (1932-1939)
Why? (1913-1914)
Wilshire's (1900-1915)
Young Spartacus (1931-1935)

NEW ESSAYS

A Quarterly Devoted to the Study of Modern Society

Volume 2
1935-1936

Introduction to the Greenwood reprint by

PAUL MATTICK

Former Editor, New Essays

Greenwood Reprint Corporation
Westport, Connecticut
1970

Introduction

Copyright © 1970 by

GREENWOOD REPRINT CORPORATION

This reprint edition reproduces the entire contents
of the original publication as far as it
has been possible to determine

This work has been printed on long-life paper
and conforms to the standards developed
under the sponsorship of the
Council on Library Resources

Printed in the United States of America

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Breathing Spell

Will there be Prosperity?

THE LENIN LEGEND

Towards State Captialism?

An the Resolution adopted by the Brussels Conference

PORTRAIT *of the* COUNTER REVOLUTION

Vol. II **Number 1**

DECEMBER 1935

$.100 YEARLY 10c A COPY

CONFLICT

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

∴ Published at 1604 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois ∴

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fightng slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

The Breathing Spell

The crisis, like much else in life, is a matter of custom; the longer one lives in it, the less detestable it is found. Even tho things are bad, still one feels that they might be worse,-- much like a man who has been in an accident and considers himself lucky to have lost only his legs and not his head. Those who are fortunate enough to return home from a battle are often still more enthused than they were on going in, and the dead are if course dumb. Complaints about the general misery finally get on the nerves even of the most sober-minded and he seeks recreation in the more colorful moments of life, whether political assasinations or the first skirmishes of the coming world war. After the day's work, the baseball or football game of grownup children still offers to indifference the necessary stimulus and energy to read the boycotted Hearst press.

The newspaper economists appear to be right: the depression was a psychological phenomenon, people merely lacked the courage for prosperity. When the crisis ceased to be spoken of, it was also quite passed . The panicky state of mind which once set people demonstrating in front of the banks because their money had already been taken up by others, the strike wave which it had been so hard to bring into legal channels, the suicides of bloated capitalists and emaciated workers, the unrest of the unemployed, -- all that is forgotten and consequently the dividends mount. General Dawes, the celebrated "voice from the Middle West", pounds his absent breast and prophesies an undreamed-of prosperity, supporting his prediction on the basis of the previous analyses, which set the turning point of the crisis at

1935. Forbes writes that " Instead of facing a long, grueling period of deflation, depression and stress, Americans now face a period of recovery which should last longer than the appaling downswing. And the coming prosperity promises to be more widely shared and enjoyed than any previous spell of prosperity," -- in which he merely gives expression to the general optimism, which is made responsible for the good business balances.

Jesse H. Jones, chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, speaks for thousands of other "leaders" in industry and business when he says that "recovery has been attained and that there is no longer any fear or any reason for fearing that something is going to fall down upon us, that some great failure or disaster may occur that would seriously disturb conditions". And in a letter to the newspaper king Roy W.Howard, Roosevelt proclaims for the whole nation: " the depression was (sic) the culmination of unhealthy, however innocent arrangements in agriculture, in business and in finance". And he finds it " a source of great satisfaction that at this moment conditions are such as to offer further substantial and widespread recovery".

So the depression is now just a matter of history; it was, and the upward movement has set in which has allowed the Roosevelt Administration to give business a breathing spell. And, for that matter, the breathing is fine.

If the causes for the depression were sought as well as found by different people in accordance with their various interests, temperaments and intellects, hence in the most various places, so the explanation for the approaching new prosperity are extremely manifold and contradictory. Just as it was generally agreed, after three years of depression, that there really was a crisis in the U.S.A., so it is also now agreed that in about three years prosperity will be really noticeable. The dispute is merely regarding the paternity of this coming prosperity, and the violence of the dispute is not owing merely to the circumstance of the forthcoming elections which render necessary a sharper division of minds. It is true that the crown which Roosevelt set on his head is being spattered with mud by the liberty-thirsting anti-New Dealers. In reality, however, no one knows what the dispute is about, no one knows what he is saying; the most that any of the disputants knows is the character of his audience. Since the blockhead constantly finds someone who is still more idiotic than himself, this dispute can be successfully waged by any one.

Now what has actually happened? The Roosevelt Administration attempted to combat the depression with

the following program (in the Chief's own words) :"The establishment of a wise balance in American economic life, to restore our banking system to public confidence, to protect investors in the security market, to give labor freedom to organize and protection from exploitation, to safeguard and develop our national resources, to set up protection against the vicissitudes incident to old age and unemployment, to relieve destitution and suffering, and to relieve investors and consumers from the burden of unneccary corporate machinery." And even the "healthy opposition" to the New Deal has to admit, Forbes writes, that " since the bottom of the depression, the progress made is impressive. Stock prices, a significant barometer, are the highest in four years Re-employment is now more encouraging than at any time since the boom. The purchasing power of our agri-cultural population has increased quite substantially. Including producing capital, our durable goods have lately, for the first time, shown real revival. The steel industry has multiplied its output fivefold since it reached nadir, and steel masters predict further gains. Banks are doing 20 to 25 per cent more business than twelve months ago. The tidal wave of dividend reductions and omissions has spent its force; resumptions and increases are now becoming more and more common." Etc., etc.

Now the fact is that none of these statements involves any responsibility; every one of them is completely without substance and expresses nothing more than Mr. Forbes's optimism -- an optimism for which he is also paid, since of course it is not until optimism sets in that business gets going. And in reality this whole optimism and this prosperity cry is based on the arbitrary generalization of individual cases; for the nation as a whole ,there is no sign of a coming prosperity or of an upswing. The government business chart gives a clearer picture regarding the actual conditions, a picture which leads to other conclusions than those which are favorable to business.

Each index below represents the percentage of "normal" (100) as of the years 1923-25, with the exception of prices; these latter are based on the year 1926.

Year-	Industrial Production	Factory Employment	Pay- rolls	Freight- loadings	Wholesale- prices
1929	119	104.8	109.1	106	95.3
1930	96	91.5	88.7	92	86.4
1931	81	77.4	67.5	75	73.0
1932	64	64.2	45.3	56	64.8
1933	84	78.0	59.1	60	70.8
1934	84	78.0	59.1	60	70.8

1935:	Industrial Production	Factory Employment	Pay-rolls	Freight-loadings	Wholesale-prices
Jan.	90	80.5	64.1	64	78.8
Feb.	89	81.9	69.1	65	79.5
March	88	82.4	70.7	65	79.3
April	86	82.3	70.7	61	80.1
May	85	81.2	68.5	61	80.2
June	86	79.9	66.4	63	79.8
July	86	80.4	65.3	58	79.4
Aug.	88	81.0	66.5	61	80.5

The most significant change of late has been in prices, which are higher than at any time in five years. Otherwise, however, since the beginning of 1935, since the beginning of the "new prosperity", no progress has been made in bringing industrial production back to "normal". The present depression is the longest in the entire history of capitalism.

Colonel Leonard P.Ayres, vice-president and economist of the Cleveland Trust Company, writes in his monthly review in October 1935: " During the last six months of this year the volume of industrial production has remained so nearly unchanged that in only one month has there been any variation. Production declined during the first quarter and has been almost stabilized since then. The level at which this has taken place has been almost exactly half-way between the low records made in 1932 and again in 1933 and the computed normal level. It is about the level reached in the autumn of 1930 and the spring of 1931." For four months, says Ayres, " no progress has been made in bringing industrial production back to normal", and he does not anticipate any change in the immediate future. The only thing of interest that he finds during the year 1935 is that it was the most stabilized period in american history. " It seems strange that this should be so," he declares, "for there has been this year a great increase in the output of the automotive industries and an important improvement in agriculture. In the second quarter we had the suspension of NRA, which might well have been expected to cause sudden important changes, and now we have the outbreak of war in Africa. Nevertheless, despite these portentous developments and many others of lesser consequence, the flow of general business has continued to move steadily forward in almost unchanging volume. There have been few serious labor disputes, only moderate price changes for most commodities and no minor business boomlets or intermediate collapses."

Altho in sharp contrast to the prevailing conception, Colonel Ayres's survey presents an objective picture of the actual situation, which permits of no optimism as regards the near future. This objectivity is,

however, merely owing to the fact that Ayres is still holding to old ideas; ideas which relate to the prosperity of 1928-29. In the meanwhile, however, various discoveries have been made which have led to a transformation of economic concepts. It is not merely that the times when one danced around the golden calf are today generally recognized as sinful and the jazz age regarded as abnormal; science also sees today that the conditions of 1929 could by no means be regarded as typical prosperity, but rather that the truly proper expression of capitalism is the stagnant depression. Prosperity is denoted as the abnormal, the crisis as the normal capitalist condition. Thus, when Professor Douglas, in his book Controlling Depressions, asserts that the previous depressions were overcome only thru pure chance, such a statement involves the view that the crisis condition is the normal one in the present system and that only an accident, which can not be counted upon, will help to evade it. And Professor H. Parker Willis, of Columbia University, writes in his book The Economics of Inflation : " It had been evident, for some time before 1929, that at some comparatively early period a reckoning must be expected, owing to the abnormal conditions then existing."

If those profitable conditions were abnormal, then the conditions of today must be rated as normal, and the present prosperity cry finds its justification by way of such a simple means as a reversal of concepts. With this logic, which prizes starving as the best nourishment, one can really solve all problems. Even tho it is true that the crisis did not first make its appearance in 1929, but as early as 1926 - or, in other words, even if the rate of accumulation fell in 1926, that is, did not advance as much as would have been necessary in order to continue the general upswing - and business took refuge in increased speculation, which could only end in the collapse of the unfavorable speculations, all which is only a sign of the crisis which has been held up but not averted, -- nevertheless this speculation is one of the normal manifestations of the capitalist system. The whole of the prosperity down to 1929 is just as normal for capitalism as the whole of the depression since 1929. And so we can hold conservatively with Ayres to the old concepts in order to make ourselves intelligible, and are thus not in a position to see in the stagnant depression signs of the coming prosperity. What is more: this very "freezing of the status quo" precludes, as we see it, any optimism whatever.

There is no doubt that, as we read in a Report, "the rise in business activity in recent months has naturally benefitted corporate earnings materially. Despite higher operating costs and increased taxes, it is currently estimated that aggregate industrial earnings in the first

quarter (1935) were some 40 per cent above the corresponding period last year, while in the second half of the year results are expected to be around 30 per cent above the 1934 level." The experts and advisers of Capital may write their reports triumphantly, but the sour taste in their mouth still remains. Roosevelt's monopolistic policy has helped industry to bring about necessary technical and economic reorganizations, which have increased profits. But with this there is still not much more attained than a rise of profit for the enterprises muddling thru the depression, and this rise of profit in itself is of little significance as regards the further development. The mass of profit may be greater than before and still at the same time too small to enable the necessarily accelerated accumulation which alone would bring with it a new general upswing. " The most interesting and important problem involved in the relatively static conditions of business," writes Colonel Ayres, "is the failure of the combination of great accumulated shortages of goods and accumulated surplusses of capital to stimulate new business activity. Idle funds have become so large that interest rates have fallen to the lowest levels ever recorded, and corporations are busily calling their bonds and reissuing them with lower coupons, but save in rare instances they are not creating genuinely new issues. Few new businesses are failing, and almost no new ones of importance are being started. It is a strange anomaly that huge shortages and accumulated idle capital are not being recognized as constituting opportunity." Surplus available for investment has been increasing until there is now a huge reservoir of bank deposits for credit expansion but of which no use is made. The figure for bank deposits for the week ended September 18, 1935, is $ 20,630,000,000, which means a rise of $ 3,320,000,000 in the last year and of $ 6,070,000,000 from the low of July 1932. This now existing surplus is expected to bring back prosperity, but there is not the slightest sign that it will be used for new productive investments. Furthermore, some of the deposits have been created by government expenditures involving no return, so that these deposits are of no value to further capitalist accumulation. It becomes increasingly obvious that developed monopoly capitalism is a stagnant and hence at the same time a rotting capitalism. While on the one hand the NRA policy, as an instrument for temporarily bridging over the opposition of the less monopolized and less concentrated capitals and for assuring economic peace in the process of this endeavor, is now a thing of the past, the tendency which it involves for the strengthening of the monopolies and the promotion of capital concentration is carried on in the new legislation, the banking bill, the taxing program, etc. Tho the NRA is dead in so far as it made the pretention of being in harmony with the interests of the workers, its monopolistic character

lives on and compels the weaker capitals to ever recurrent protests, which can not, however, hold up the eventual ruin already announced in the economic stagnation. The big monopolies have to accumulate on an expanded scale, and that is the very thing which they find to be neither profitable nor possible. In order to hold what they have, their own stagnation has to be made a universal affair, and manifests itself in the strangling of the initiative of the smaller capitals, which - however paradoxical it may sound- precisely by reason of their weakness, still have possibilities of accumulation in conditions which preclude accumulation for the big monopolies. Still, the strangle-hold of the monopolies does not allow the smaller capitals to actualize their opportunities. Until the monopolies are able further to accumulate, economic stagnation is the only economic possibility, even tho at the same time it involves the slow destruction of the weaker capitals and must increasingly impoverish the workers. The breathing spell spoken of today can be appraised only within the capitalist blind alley. Whatever the drivel in the labor press about high profits, the fact is that they are not high enough to continue the accumulation of monopoly capital at the necessary tempo. The whole enormous reorganization of capital with a view to better profitability has resulted in nothing more than the maintenance of a certain crisis level. Factors which at an earlier date would have enabled overcoming the crisis merely suffice today to hold up the too rapid descent and offer nothing more than the possibility of temporary stabilization at a given point of crisis. This state of affairs has only one future : the sharpening of the crisis and eventually a new temporary stabilization at a still lower level.

The prospects offered monopoly capital by this breathing spell are those of seeking in new military encounters a redistribution of the sources of profit, conforming better to the profit needs. But under the present conditions each imperialist nation can assure and better its existence only at the cost of other nations, since a general world-wide upswing thru imperialistic reorganization is not to be expected; and this is equivalent to saying that the military attempts at overcoming can only lead to the sharpening of the world crisis. The only visible prospects for the small capitals are their destruction by way of bankruptcies. The middle class likewise is confronted only with its further pauperization, and it is only for the smaller part of the class that the pauperization is alleviated thru fascism. Fascism, which would grant parts of the middle class temporary concessions at the expense of the workers, defers the pauperization of the middle class without averting it. The hopelessness of the whole situation becomes extremely clear in the now concluded

investigation of the Brookings Institution on "Income and Social Progress", which sees as the only solution of the present difficulties a lowering of commodity prices without further restriction of mass purchasing power. This innocent position contains the whole capitalistic dilemma, and this in spite of the fact that it is a false statement of the problem. The really essential thing in capitalism is the capitalist purchasing power, which has to be increased, but which can only be increased thru the restriction of "mass purchasing power". In other words, the lowering of commodity prices means nothing more than the continuance of accumulation. So that Moulton says for the Brookings Institution practically only this: In order to attain prosperity, we have to prosper. To bring this wisdom to light, the Institution has expended $ 150,000 for research purposes.

Capital knows only one way out of the crisis: more profit. And this more can only be driven out of the workers. Since the NRA went under, more than 20,000 firms have cut wages, lengthened the working day, increased the intensity of the labor process. Unemployment has not essentially decreased. This years relief grants have been set at $ 1,227,973,573, as compared with $ 1,013,069,738 in the corresponding ten months of last year. Today relief is being cut everywhere, often more than 10 per cent. The unemployed on relief jobs receive wages which are only a little more than the relief rates. The more the workers are impoverished, however, the more talk is heard of social security: hope is to take the place of bread. But the capitalists know, better than all the social reformers, what is really going on, and one such social reformer recently received from Henry Ford the ironic but no less pertinent answer: " You can't make security one-sided; who is going to secure the securities ? " And since the "securities" are still the lords of the world, there can hardly be any question that they will first make themselves secure.

Factory employment since March 1935 is estimated to have dropped 1.4 points and pay rolls to have declined 4.2 points. In view of this difference, capital breathes for the moment somewhat more freely. But the breathing spell is brief; soon capitalism will again strike about itself like a drowning man, and one will be very patriotic and speak enthusiastically of a new world war.

****
****
***

T H E L E N I N L E G E N D.

* * * * * *
*

The yellower and more leatherly the skin of the mummified Lenin grows, and the higher the statistically determined number of visitors to the Lenin Mausoleum climbs, the less are people concerned about the real Lenin and his historical significance. More and more monuments are erected to his memory, more and more motion pictures turned out in which he is the central figure, more and more books written about him, and the Russian confectioners mold sweetmeats in forms which bear his features. And yet the fadedness of the faces on the chocolate Lenins is matched by the unclarity and the improbability of the stories which are told about him. Though the Lenin Institute in Moscow may publish his collected works, they no longer have any meaning beside the fantastic legends which have formed around his name. As soon as people began to concern themselves with Lenin's collar-buttons, they also ceased to bother about his ideas. Everyone then fashions his own Lenin, and if not after his own image, at any rate after his own desires. What the Napoleonic legend is to France, and the legend of Fredricus Rex to Germany, the Lenin legend is to the new Russia. Just as people once absolutely refused to believe in the death of Napoleon, and just as they hoped for the resurrection of Fredricus Rex, so in Russia still today there are peasants to whom the new "little father Czar" has not died, but continues to indulge his insatiable appetite in demanding from them ever fresh tribute. Others light eternal lamps under the picture of Lenin; to them he is a saint, a redeemer to whom one prays for aid. Millions of eyes stare at millions of these pictures, and see in Lenin the Russian Moses, St. George, Ulysses, Hercules, God or Devil. The Lenin cult has become a new religion before which even the atheistic communists gladly bend the knee; it makes life easier in every respect. Lenin appears to them as the father of the Soviet Republic, the man who made victory possible for the revolution, the great leader without whom they themselves would not exist. But not only in Russia and not only in popular legend, but also to a large part of the Marxist intelligentsia throughout the world, the Russian Revolution has become a world event so closely bound up with the genius of Lenin that one gets the impression that without him that revolution and hence also world history might possibly have taken an essentially different course. A truly objective analysis of the Russian Revolution, however, will at once reveal the untenability of such an idea.

"The assertion that history is made by great men is from a theoretical standpoint wholly unfounded". Such are the

words in which Lenin himself turns on the legend which insists on making him alone responsible for the success of the Russian Revolution. He considered the World War determining as regards the direct cause of its outbreak and for the time of its occurence. Yes, without that war, he says, "the revolution would possibly have been postponed for decades longer". The idea that the outbreak and the course of the Russian Revolution depended in very large measure on Lenin necessarily implies a complete identification of the revolution with the taking over of power by the Bolsheviks. Trotsky has made a remark to the effect that the entire credit for the success of the October uprising belongs to Lenin; against the opposition of almost all his party friends, the resolution for insurrection was carried by him alone. But the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks did not give to the revolution the spirit of Lenin; on the contrary, Lenin had so completely adapted himself to the necessities of the revolution that practically he fulfilled the task of that class which he ostensibly combatted. Of course it is often asserted that with the taking over of state power by the Bolsheviks, the originally bourgeois-democratic revolution was forthwith converted into the socialist-proletarian one. But is it really possible for anyone seriously to believe that a single political act is capable of taking the place of a whole historical development; that seven months--from February to October--sufficed to form the economic presuppositions of a socialist revolutioniin a country which was just engaged in getting rid of its feudal and absolutistic fetters, in order to give freer play to the forces of modern capitalism?

Up until the Revolution, and in very large measure even yet today, the decisive role in the economic and social development of Russia was played by the agrarian question. Of the 174 million inhabitants prior to War, only 24 million lived in cities. In each thousand of the gainfully employed, 719 were engaged in agriculture. In spite of their enormous economic importance, the majority of the peasants still led a wretched existence. The cause of their deplorable situation was the insufficiency of soil. State, nobility and large landed proprietors assured to themselves with asiatic brutality an unconscionable exploitation of the population.

Since the abolition of serfdom (1861) the scarcity of land for the peasant masses had constantly been the question around which all others revolved in Russian domestic politics. It formed the main object of all reform endeavors, which saw in it the driving power of the approaching revolution, which had to be turned aside. The financial policy of the czarist regime, with its ever new levies of indirect taxes, worsened the situation of the

peasants still more. The expenditures for the army, the fleet, the state apparatus, attained gigántic proportions. The greater part of the State budget went for unproductive purposes, which totally ruined the economic foundation of agriculture.

"Freedom and Land" was thus the necessary revolutionary demand of the peasants. Under this watchword occurred a series of peasant uprisings which soon, in the period from 1902 to 1906, assumed significant scope. In combination with the mass strike movements of the workers taking place at the same time, they produced such a violent commotion in the heart of Czarism that that period may in truth be denoted as a "dress rehearsal" for the revolution of 1917. The way in which Czarism reacted to these rebellions is best illustrated by the expression of the then vice-governor of Tambiovsk, Bogdanovitch: "Few arrested, the more shot". And one of the officers who had taken part in the suppression of the insurrections wrote: "All around us, bloodshed; everything going up in flames; we shoot, strike down, stab". It was in this sea of blood and flames that the revolution of 1917 was born.

Notwithstanding the defeats, the pressure of the peasants grew more and more menacing. It led to the Stolypin reforms, which, however, were only empty gestures, stopped short with promises and in reality brought the agrarian question not a single step forward. But once the little finger has had to be extended, there will soon be snatching for the whole hand. The further worsening of the peasants' situation during the war, the defeat of the czarist armies on the fronts, the growing revolt in the cities, the chaotic czarist policy in which all reason was thrown overboard, the general dilemma resulting to all classes of society, led to the February revolution, which first of all finally brought about the violent solution of the agrarian question, which had been a burning one during the past half century. Its political character, however, was not impressed upon this revolution by the peasant movement; this movement merely gave it its great power. In the first announcements of the central executive committee of the Petersburg workers' and soldiers' councils, the agrarian question was not even mentioned. But the peasants soon forced themselves upon the attention of the new government. Tired of waiting for it to take action in the agrarian question, in April and May of 1917 the disappointed peasant masses began to appropriate the land for themselves. The soldiers on the fronts, fearful of failing to get their proper share in the new distribution, abandoned the trenches and hurried back to their villages. They took their weapons with them, however, and thus offered the new government no possibility of restraining them. All its appeals to the sentiment of nationality and the sacredness of Russian interests

were of no avail against the urge of the masses to provide at last for their own economic needs. And those needs were embraced in peace and land. It was related at the time that peasants who were implored to remain on the front, as otherwise the Germans would occupy Moscow, were quite puzzled and answered the government emissaries: "And what's that to us? Why, we're from the Tamboff Government".

Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not invent the winning slogan, "Land to the peasants"; rather, they accepted the real peasant revolution going on independently of them. Taking advantage of the vacillating attitude of the Kerensky regime, which still hoped to be able to settle the agrarian question by way of peaceful discussion, the Bolsheviks won the good-will of the peasants and were thus enabled to drive the Kerensky government out and take over the power themselves. But this was possible for them only as agents of the peasants' will, by sanctioning their appropriation of land, and it was only through their support that the Bolsheviks were able to maintain themselves in power.

The slogan "Land to the peasants" has nothing to do with communist principles. The cutting up of the large estates into a great number of small independent farming enterprises was a measure directly opposed to socialism, and which could be justified only on the ground of tactical necessity. The subsequent changes in the peasant policy of Lenin and the Bolsheviks were powerless to effect any change in the necessary consequences of this original opportunistic policy. In spite of all the collectivizing, which up to now is largely limited to the technical side of the productive process, Russian agriculture is still today basically determined by private economic interests and motives. And this involves the impossibility, in the industrial field as well, of arriving at more than a state-capitalist economy. Even though this state capitalism aims at transforming the farming population completely into exploitable agricultural wage workers, this goal is not at all likely to be attained in view of the new revolutionary encounters bound up with such a venture. The present collectivizing cannot be regarded as the fulfillment of socialism. This becomes clear when one considers that observers of the Russian scene such as Maurice Hindus hold it possible that "even if the Soviets were to collapse, Russian agriculture would remain collectivized, with control more perhaps in the hands of the peasants than of the government". However, even if the bolshevist agricultural policy were to lead to the desired end, even a state capitalism extending to all branches of national economy, the situation of the workers would still remain unchanged. Nor could such a consummation be regarded as a transition to real socialism, since those elements of the population

now privileged by the state capitalism would defend their privileges against all changes in exactly the same way as did the private owners previously at the time of the 1917 revolution.

The industrial workers still formed a very small minority of the population, and were accordingly unable to impress upon the Russian Revolution a character in keeping with their own needs. The bourgeois elements which likewise were combatting Czarism, soon recoiled before the nature of their own tasks. They could not accede to the revolutionary solution of the agrarian question, since a general expropriation of land might all too easily bring in its train the expropriation of industry. Neither the peasants nor the workers followed them and the fate of the bourgeoisie was decided by the temporary alliance between these latter groups. It was not the bourgeoisie but the workers who brought the bourgeois revolution to its conclusion; the place of the capitalists was taken over by the bolshevist state apparatus under the Leninist slogan: "If capitalism anyhow, then let's make it". Of course the workers in the cities had overthrown capitalism, but only in order now to convert the bolshevist party apparatus into their new masters. In the industrial cities the workers' struggle went on under socialist demands, seemingly independent of the peasant revolution under way at the same time and yet in a decisive sense determined by this latter. The original revolutionary demands of the workers were objectively incapable of being carried thru. To be sure, the workers were able, with the aid of the peasants, to win the state power for their party, but this new State soon took a position directly opposed to the workers' interests. An opposition which even today has assumed forms which actually make it possible to speak of a "Red Czarism": suppression of strikes, deportations, mass executions, and hence also the coming to life of new illegal organizations which are conducting a communist revolt against the present bogus socialism. The talk just now about an extension of democracy in Russia, the thougth of introducing a sort of parliamentarism, the resolution at the last soviet congress about dismantling the dictatorship, all this is merely a tactical manoeuver designed to compensate for the governments latest acts of violence against the opposition. These promises are not to be taken seriously, but are an outgrowth of the Leninist practice, which was always well calculated to work both ways at the same time in the interest of its own stability and security. The zigzag course of the Leninist policy springs from the necessity of conforming constantly to the shiftings of class forces in Russia in such manner that the government may always remain master of the situation. And so there is accepted today what was rejected the day before, or vice versa; unprincipledness has been elevated into a principle, and the Leninist

party is concerned with only one thing, namely, the exercise of state power at any price.

At this place, however, we are interested only in making clear that the Russian Revolution was not dependent on Lenin or on the Bolsheviks, but that the decisive element in it was the revolt of the peasants. And for that matter Zinoviev, still in power at the time and on Lenin's side, had stated as late as the 11th Bolshevik Party Congress (March-April 1921): "It was not the proletarian vanguard on our side, but the coming over to us of the army, because we demanded peace, which was the decisive factor in our victory. The army, however, consisted of peasants. If we had not been supported by the millions of peasant soldiers, our victory over the bourgeoisie would have been out of the question". The great interest of the peasants in the matter of land, the slight interest with reference to the question of government, enabled the Bolshevists to conduct a victorious struggle for the government. The peasants were quite willing to leave the Kremlin to the Bolsheviks, provided only that they themselves were not interfered with in their own struggle against the large estate owners.

But even in the cities, Lenin was not the decisive factor in the conflicts between capital and Labor. On the contrary, he was helplessly drawn along in the wake of the workers, who in their demands and actual measures went far beyond the Bolsheviks. It was not Lenin who conducted the revolution, but the revolution conducted him. Though as late as the October uprising, Lenin restricted his earlier and more thorough-going demands to that for control of production, and wished to stop short with the socialization of the banks and transportation facilities, without the general abolition of private ownership, the workers paid no further attention to his views and expropriated all enterprises. It is interesting to recall that the first decree of the bolshevik government was directed against the wild, unauthorized expropriations of factories through the workers' councils. But these soviets were still stronger than the party apparatus, and they compelled Lenin to issue the decree for the nationalization of all industrial enterprises. It was only under the pressure brought to bear by the workers that the Bolsheviks consented to this change in their own plans. Gradually, through the extension of state power, the influence of the soviets became weakened, until today they no longer serve more than decorative purposes.

During the first years of the revolution, up to the introduction of the New Economic Policy (1921), there was actually of course some experimentation in Russia in the communist sense. This is not, however, to be set down to the account of Lenin, but of those forces which made of

him a political chameleon who at one time assumed a reactionary and at another a revolutionary color. New peasant uprisings against the Bolsheviks first drive Lenin to a more radical policy, a stronger emphasis upon the interests of the workers and the poor peasants who had come off short-handed in connection with the first distribution of land. But then this policy proves a failure since the poor peasants whose interests are thus preferred refuse to support the Bolsheviks and Lenin "turns the face again to the middle peasants". In such a case, Lenin has no scruples about strengthening the private-capitalist elements anew, and the earlier allies, who have now grown uncomfortable, are shot down with cannon, as was the case in Kronstadt.

The power, and nothing but the power; it is to this that the whole political wisdom of Lenin finally reduces. The fact that the paths along which it is attained, the means which lead to it, determine in their turn the manner in which that power is applied, was a matter with which he had very little concern. Socialism, to him, was in the last instance merely a kind of state capitalism, after the "model of the German postal service". And this state capitalism he overtook on his way, for in fact there was nothing else to be overtaken. It was merely a question of who was to be the beneficiary of the state capitalism, and here Lenin gave precedence to none. And so George Bernard Shaw, returning from Russia, was quite correct when, in a lecture before the Fabian Society in London, he stated that "the Russian communism is nothing more than the putting into practice of the Fabian program which we have been preaching the last forty years".

No one, however, has yet suspected the Fabians of containing a world-revolutionary force. And Lenin is, of course, first of all acclaimed as a world revolutionary, notwithstanding the fact that the present Russian government, by which his "estate" is administered, issues emphatic denial when the press publishes reports of Russian toasts to the world revolution, as happened recently in connection with reports of the New York Times on the All-Russian Congress of Soviets. The legend of the world-revolutionary significance of Lenin receives its nourishment from his consistent international position during the World War. It was quite impossible for Lenin at that time to conceive that a Russian revolution would have no further repercussions and be abandoned to itself. There were two reasons for this view: first, because such a thought was in contradiction with the objective situation resulting from the World War; and secondly, he assumed that the onslaught of the imperialist nations against the Bolsheviks would break the back of the Russian Revolution if the proletariat of Western Europe failed to come to the rescue. Lenin's call for the world revolution was

primarily a call for support and maintenance of bolshevik power. The proof that it was not much more than this is furnished by his inconsistency in this question: in addition to making his demands for world revolution, he at the same time came out for the "right of self-determination of all oppressed peoples", for their national liberation. Yet this double-entry bookkeeping sprang likewise from the jacobinical need of the Bolsheviks for holding on to power. With both slogans the forces of intervention of the capitalist countries in Russian affairs was weakened, since their attention was thus diverted to their own territories and colonies. That meant a respite for the Bolsheviks. In order to make it as long as possible, Lenin and the Bolsheviks used their International. It set for itself a double task: on the one hand, to subordinate the workers of Western Europe and America to the will of Moscow; on the other, to strengthen the influence of Moscow upon the peoples of Eastern Asia. Work on the international field was modeled after the course of the Russian Revolution. The goal was that of combining the interests of the workers and peasants on a world-wide scale and control of them through the Bolsheviks, by means of the Communist International. In this way at least the bolshevist state power in Russia received support; and in case the world revolution should really spread, the power over the world was to be won. Though the first design was attended with success, at the same time the second failed of accomplishment. The world revolution was unable to make headway as an enlarged imitation of the Russian, and the national limitations of the victory in Russia necessarily made of the Bolsheviks a counter-revolutionary force on the international plane. Hence also the demand for the "world revolution" was converted into the "theory of the building of socialism in one country". And this is not a perversion of the Leninist standpoint--as Trotsky, for example, asserts today--but the direct consequence of the pseudo world-revolutionary policy pursued by Lenin himself.

It was clear at that time, even to many Bolsheviks, that the restriction of the revolution to Russia would make of the Russian Revolution itself a factor by which the world revolution would be impeded. Thus, for example, Eugene Varga wrote in his book "Economic Problems of the Proletarian Dictatorship", published by the Communist International (1921): "The danger exists that Russia may be cut out as the motive power of the international revolution.....There are communists in Russia who have grown tired of waiting for the European revolution and wish to make the best of their national isolation.....With a Russia which would regard the social revolution of the other countries as a matter with which it had no concern, the capitalist countries would at any rate be able to live in peaceful neighborliness. I am far from believing that

such a bottling up of revolutionary Russia would be able to stop the progress of the world revolution. But that progress would be slowed down". And with the sharpening domestic crises in Russia around that time, it was not long before almost all communists, including Varga himself, had the feeling of which Varga here complains. In fact, still earlier, even in 1920. Lenin and Trotsky took pains to stem the revolutionary forces of Europe. Peace throughout the world was required in order to assure the building of state capitalism in Russia under the auspices of the Bolsheviks. It was inadvisable to have this peace disturbed either by way of war or new revolutions, for in either case a country like Russia was sure to be drawn in. Accordingly Lenin imposed, through splitting and intrigue, a neo-reformist course upon the labor movement of Western Europe, a course which led to its total dissolution. It was with sharp words indeed that Trotsky, with the approval of Lenin, turned on the uprising in Central Germany (1921): "We must flatly say to the German workers that we regard this philosophy of the offensive as the greatest danger and in its practical application as the greatest political crime". And in another revolutionary situation, in 1923, Trotsky declared to the correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, again with the approval of Lenin: "We are of course interested in the victory of the working classes, but it is not at all to our interest to have the revolution break out in a Europe which is bled and exhausted, and to have the proletariat receive from the hands of the bourgeoisie nothing but ruins. We are interested in the maintenance of peace". And ten years later, when Hitler seized power, the Communist International did not move a finger to prevent. Trotsky is not only in error, but reveals a failure of memory resulting no doubt from the loss of his uniform, when today he characterizes Stalin's failure to help the German communists as a betrayal of the principles of Leninism. This betrayal was constantly practised by Lenin and Trotsky himself. But according to a dictum of Trotsky's, the important thing is, of course, not what is done, but who does it. Stalin is, as a matter of fact, the best disciple of Lenin, insofar as concerns his attitude to German fascism. The Bolsheviks have also, of course, not refrained from entering into alliances with Turkey and lending political and economic support to the government of that country even at a time when the sharpest measures were being taken there against the communists,--measures which frequently eclipsed even the actions of a Hitler.

In view of the fact that the Communist International in sofar as it continues to function is merely an agency for the Russian tourist trade, in view of the collapse in all countries of the communist movements controlled from Moscow, the legend of Lenin, the world-revolutionist, is no doubt sufficiently weakened that one may

count on its disappearance in the near future. And of course even today the hangers-on of the Communist International are no longer operating with the concept of the world revolution, but speak of the "Workers Fatherland", from which they draw their enthusiasm so long as they are not forced to live in it as workers. Those who continue to acclaim Lenin as the world revolutionary par excellence are as a matter of fact getting excited about nothing more than Lenin's political dreams of world-wide power, dreams which faded to nothingness in the light of day.

The contradiction existing between the real historical significance of Lenin and that which is generally ascribed to him is greater and,at the same time, more inscrutable than in the case of any other personage acting on modern history. We have shown that he cannot be made responsible for the success of the Russian Revolution, and also that his theory and practice cannot, as is so often done, be appraised as of world-revolutionary importance. Neither, in spite of all assertions to the contrary, can be be regarded as having extended or supplemented Marxism. In the work of Thomas B. Brameld, entitled "A Philosophical Approach to Communism", recently published by the University of Chicago, communism is still defined as "a synthesis of the doctrines of Marx, Engels and Lenin". It is not only in this book, but also generally, and quite particularly in the party-communist press, that Lenin is placed in such a relation to Marx and Engels. Stalin has denoted "Leninism" as "Marxism in the period of imperialism". Such a position, however, derives its only justification from an unfounded overestimation of Lenin. Lenin has not added to Marxism a single element which could be rated as new and independent. Lenin's philosophical outlook is dialectical materialism as developed by Marx, Engels and Plechanov. It is to it that he refers in connection with all important problems; it is his criterion in everything and the final court of appeal. In his main philosophical work, "Materialism and Empirocriticism", he merely repeats Engels in tracing the oppositions of the different philosophical points of view back to the one great contradiction: Materialism vs. Idealism. While for the first position , Nature is primary and Mind secondary, exactly the opposite holds of the other. This previously known formulation is documented by Lenin with additional material from the various fields of knowledge. And so there can be no thought of any essential enrichment of the marxian dialectic on the part of Lenin. In the field of philosophy, to speak of a Leninist school is impossible

In the field of economic theory, also, no such independent significance can be ascribed to Lenin. Lenin's economic writings are more marxist than those of any of his contemporaries, but they are only brilliant applications

of the already existing economic doctrines associated with Marxism. Lenin had absolutely no thought of being an independent theoretician in matters of economics; to him, Marx had already said everything fundamental in this field. Since, to his mind, it was quite impossible to go beyond Marx, he concerned himself with nothing further than proving that the marxist postulates were in accord with the actual development. His principal work on economics, "The Development of Capitalism in Russia", is eloquent testimony on this point. Lenin never wanted to be more than Marx's disciple, and so it is only in legend that one can speak of a theory of "leninism".

Lenin wanted above all else to be a practical politician. His theoretical works are almost exclusively of a polemic nature. They combat the theoretical and other enemies of Marxism, which Lenin identifies with his own political strivings and those of the Bolsheviks generally. To Marxism, practice decides regarding the truth of a theory As a practician endeavoring to actualize the doctrines of Marx, Lenin may have actually rendered Marxism an enormous service. However, as regards Marxism again, every practice is a social one, which can be modified and influenced by individuals only in very limited measure, never decisively. There is no doubt that the union of theory and practice, of final goal and concrete questions of the moment, with which Lenin was constantly concerned, may be acclaimed as a great accomplishment. But the criterion for this accomplishment is again the success which attends it, and that success, as we have already said, was denied to Lenin. His work not only failed to advance the world revolutionary movement; it also failed to form the preconditions for a truly socialist society in Russia. The success (such as it was) did not bring him nearer to his goal, but pushed it farther into the distance.

The actual condition in Russia and the present situation of the workers throughout the world ought really to be sufficient proof to any communist observer that the present "leninist" policy is just the opposite of that expressed by its phraseology. And in the long run such a condition must without doubt destroy the artificially constructed Lenin Legend, so that history itself will finally set Lenin in his proper historical place.

* * * * * *

:::::::::::::::::

* * * * * *

* * * * * * * * *
* * * * *

On the resolution adopted by

T H E B R U S S E L S C O N F E R E N C E

The Group of International Communists of Holland has taken a stand on the result of the Brussels conference (cf. Council Correspondence #11, Sept. 1935) and its views of the conceptions there formulated are set forth below. The editorial board of Council Correspondence has found it necessary to leave out portions of the dutch criticism, since they deal with matters which are foreign to our readers, as, for example, the discussion regarding the present tasks of the german council movement. The Council Communists of America will shortly publish their own views regarding the Brussels conference and the discussion to which it has given rise. It may be stated at once, however, that we agree neither with the conference resolution nor with the criticism here presented. We have to regard them both merely as contributions to a discussion which will have to be further extended before it can lead to a truly international program.

In the first part of the Brussels resolution it is stated that no fundamental differences of opinion exist regarding the international tendencies of capitalist development and the resulting tasks and tactical necessities. Such differences of opinion do, however, exist, and we wish to refer to them briefly here. It is not very difficult, for example, to see that the "actual conditions" in Germany are interpreted from two different points of view, and for this reason also the statement of these "actual conditions" must turn out different. Our "Basic Principles on Communist Production and Distribution", our conception regarding the capitalist laws of motion, as we have published them, form the criterion of our judgment of the german situation. The german delegates at the conference saw the situation in Germany from the viewpoint of the daily, practical struggle against the bourgeoisie under National Socialism. To them, accordingly, the question as to how the council communists must organize themselves (groups of three, five, etc.) is of more importance than the question as to how the working class itself is to appropriate the necessary knowledge of

the forces by which society is moved. Their conception of the tasks and tactic of the council communists of the new labor movement is directly influenced by the practical necessities of the daily struggle; theory occupies second place, and is regarded as resulting from experience of the practical class struggle. They go still a step farther, however; they want to take what is believed to have been found as the tasks and tactic of the council communists as a result of the practical struggle against National Socialism in Germany and give it validity as a directive for the council communists on an international scale. And this because in their view the development throughout the world is driving to conditions like those in Germany. . . .

The actively working groups in Germany have not yet completely broken with the conceptions of the old labor movement now in a state of collapse. Thus we see it is not true that theory is a secondary matter resulting from practice and experience. Without a certain insight into the course of the process of development of society, and without the conception deduced therefrom regarding the tasks to be mastered, not a single movement is possible. Inversely: theoretical insight is the presupposition of any movement which wants not merely to incite to insurrection and to rebel against suppression, but wants to work in a revolutionary sense, that is, in a manner calculated to transform society. . . . Thru the entire resolution there runs like a red line the endeavor to construct on an international scale: the shaping of an international program and of an international speaking-tube for propagating the same; forming of a committee for binding together more firmly the international work; organizational and financial measures; international support. In short, the new fifth or sixth International is here present in crudely revised edition; all that is still needed is to give it, after a few conferences, a more concrete form, and then the international party work on the basis of the adopted program can begin. It is beyond the scope of these remarks to furnish the proof that in this way we enter once more upon the path of the old labor movement. We confine ourselves here to stating that such a conception regarding the tasks of the new labor movement stands in contradiction to that of the dutch group. We are not of the opinion that an international council organization has to be formed, with a ready-made program, into which organization hereafter all those will enter which embrace its program. We are of the opinion that revolutionary workers throughout the world must form independent groups to the end of developing <u>themselves</u>, forming their own orientation and thus becoming independent. The embracing of a party, or council-program, acts as a hindrance to this process of independent development. We are further

of the opinion that under the very sort of conditions that exist in Germany it is only such independent groups that are possible. The building up of a straight-laced, international organization, held together by means of a program, will prove illusory.

The working class itself must be in a position to orient itself continually, ever anew; it must be able to analyze and see through the social relations. In a word: it must itself be able to do what parties and leaders think that they have to do for it. That can come about, however, only provided that in independent groups this "self-orientation" is constantly accomplished and becomes daily practice.

What can we do in the matter? We can propagate this recognition; namely, that the new labor movement must necessarily take this course if the working class is to attain victory. What today takes place sporadically or, if on a larger scale, still only spontaneously, must take place consciously and be recognized as a necessity. Just as in revolutionary time (19 19-20) we recognized the independent shop organizations as the instrument for the mastering of production, so we now recognize in the independent discussion and propaganda groups the instrument for intelligently mastering the social forces. It is a matter of propagating and spreading this recognition: that is the one side of our activity. The other is this: that we show how such groups have to work, in what the essential part of their activity consists, and what methods they have to employ in order to master their tasks. We ourselves must be such a group.

The second part of the resolution surely shows that the analysis of the social relations differs even in the small circle of the groups represented at the conference. The resolution here posits the development of bourgeois society to state capitalism, and draws the conclusion that the mammoth economy on a continental scale is putting itself across as planned economy. And the opinion is expressed that capitalism will overcome in this space the competitive struggle by which it is disrupted. We should like to go on and ask: What stands in the way of carrying this thought construction through to its end and asserting that finally, when the continental oppositions are fought out (the resolution assumes that in order to conduct this struggle the oppositions within the continents will be overcome through state capitalism), capitalism by means of planned economy will eliminate the competitive struggle on a world-wide scale and overcome its crises?

Hitherto we have met with such a characterization of the capitalist development only among the social democrats,

tho with the difference that the social democrats welcome this alleged development because it "smoothes the way" for socialism, while the resolution wants to overcome it through the communist revolution. The group in Holland rejects this analysis as false and unmarxist. We have been demonstrating for years, in our writings, the exact ppposite; namely, that capitalism reels from one crisis into another--and furthermore, we have published and are still publishing arguments of our american comrades who have coined the concept of the "permanent crisis"and who say that capitalism and planned economy are contradictions which mutually exclude each other.

The analysis of capitalist development as given in the resolution is not an analysis in the marxist sense, because it sets out from the assumption that through organizational and political measures on the part of the state power the inner contradictions of capitalism can be overcome and systematically ordered. The marxist analysis, on the other hand, has as its starting point that the inner contradictions of capitalism (inc. competitive struggle) are at the same time its vital element. Now if one assumes that these contradictions are overcome through planned and mammoth economy under state capitalism, then under such an economy one can also no longer speak of capitalism. One is then at home in the fascist fancy of overcoming capital rule through the omnipotence of the fascist or national-socialist party State. Here the owners and masters of the means of production--private entrepreneurs, trust- and monopoly magnates, etc.--are given the new designation of "leaders", while the wage-workers employed by them are made over into their "following". The idea is borrowed from feudal conditions and is hence utopian; it is incapable of affecting capitalist reality with all its contradictions and the resulting crises.

The social-democratic idea of the overcoming of the capitalist crises through international trustification of capital ("general cartel" of Hilferding) is also of utopian character. Here also the development of capitalist society appears as a process of concentration carried out by persons, the owners of capital. These owners of capital are at the same time, by reason of such ownership, commanders of productive processes. If, now, this command over capitalist production is combined through capital concentration, in "one hand", then in this general command, according to Hilferding, the goal of the capitalist development is attained. The capitalist general command can then no longer pursue any capitalist ends, it is itself the end-result of the capitalist development. Therefore it must now direct the economy according to plan,--no longer capitalistically,chaotically, in the mutual competitive struggle by which the inner

contradictions are reproduced on an ever higher level,-- but in accordance with new, socialist ends. Naturally, the social democrats are of the opinion that they know the socialist ends better than the capital owners; their endeavor is to take over the general command themselves. It is scarcely necessary to say in this connection that this social-democratic conception is fully shared by the Bolsheviks (Lenin). The thing that distinguishes these latter from the official social democrats is merely the manner in which they have brought about the change of command: the Bolsheviks by way of revolution and the Social Democrats by way of bourgeois democracy.

The historical progression appears here, just as in the fascist fancy, as the action of persons. Today it is capital owners, acting according to capitalist motives, which finally find their goal in the completed concentration of capital; tomorrow it is party leaders, revolutionary dictator, centrally directed economic organization, acting according to social-democratic, communist, national-socialist party programs.

The marxist analysis turns this fancy around and stands it on its feet. It shows that the capitalist mode of production consists essentially in the separation of the direct producers from their conditions of labor, while at the same time production is carried on socially. The means of production belong to non-workers; the workers themselves can produce with them only in case they sell their labor power, and hence themselves as workers, to the owners of the means of production. The workers are thus themselves turned into a means for the purpose of producing, into a flesh-and-blood productive instrument in the hands of the capitalists. The capitalist mode of production is accordingly a certain relation of human beings among each other, namely, the relation in which they stand to the reproduction of their vital conditions. From this relation, which is historically given, arises the concentration of capital as a natural necessity, for this concentration is essentially nothing other than the separation of the producers from their means of labor and carried to the extreme. One can also say just as well that the capitalistic productive relation of human beings among each other - which consists essentially in the expropriation of the producers - is accomplished on an ever higher level.

In this analysis, the capital owners by whom the concentration of capital is brought about appear as acting persons in an inevitable process of development, in the development of the capitalistic relation of human beings to each other. And this process, from which all the inner contradictions of capitalist economy arise, cannot

be held up through planning at any desired stage of development, or altered in its result, any more than one can alter the fact that fire develops heat and consumes fuel. So long as social production is carried on in the forms of expropriation of the producers and of appropriation of the product by non-workers, so long also does this appropriation reproduce itself on an ever higher level and so long also will the capital owners fight among each other for the booty. This holds for state planned-economy on the national, continental or world-wide scale (whether under national-socialist, social-democratic or bolshevist leadership is a matter of indifference) as well as for the mammoth capital organization sketched by the social democrat Hilferding in his general cartel.

The development to planned and mammoth economy as set forth in the resolution obviously sets out from the supposition that the planning can be brought about by way of the state power. This statement of the capitalist development is insofar essentially the same as that of the exponents of planned economy. It is distinguished from this latter only in the fact that it predicts as a consequence of this would-be planned economy an ever sharper opposition between capital owners and wage working class. This prediction comes somewhat as a surprise: for if one holds planning under capitalism to be possible, then surely the situation of the working class is also embraced in the general scheme. A planned economy which fails to take account of that is unthinkable, even tho one holds state planned economy to be possible. We must accordingly assume that the planned economy is thought of as a forced welding together of the owning class through the omnipotence of the State, which suppresses the competitive struggle among the class and prescribes its share of the earnings. On the other side, again through the omnipotence of the State, the wage workers are assigned their share of the product--and, to be sure, as the resolution assumes, a share which becomes smaller and smaller.

But why, then, must the share of the workers become smaller? The Bolshevists, and also the National Socialists, promise the workers that their situation in life is to become better just as soon as the socialist construction within the framework of the planned economy is once sufficiently advanced. What is the source of the resolution's assertion that this state planned economy can bring only sharpened exploitation, if after all it regards this planned economy as possible? Is the increased exploitation of the workers owing to the bad leaders of the National Socialists or Bolsheviks, or to the distorted program, or to the circumstance that the plan is directed to the workers' impoverishment? No, it

will be answered, the best leadership and planned economy cannot affect the fact that the exploitation and the opposition between owning and wage-working class grows sharper, for capital requires its profit. That, however, is the same thing as saying that the laws of motion of the capitalist mode of production assert themselves in opposition to all planned economy. With the expression of this latter view, the first, which holds planned economy under capitalism to be possible, is again overthrown; the one conception excludes the other.

We are unable to conceive that such a self-contradictory characterization of capitalist development can become the common conception and also starting-point of the international council movement. We are of the opinion that the german comrades have been dazzled by the theatrical magniloquence of the national-socialist State and have taken appearance for reality. That in itself would not matter so much if this appearance had not led to a theory which, even though set forth with windings and turnings, breaks with the marxist mode of thought. That, however, is what has happened in the resolution, so that finally the door is opened for all possible personal views and opinions which may be anything whatever except "general basic conceptions" for the new labor movement now arising.

***

PORTRAIT OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTION

- - - - - - -

Capitalism is now, as we have all heard, in its stage of decline. That means--to anyone who has no illusions about the conduct of a ruling class--that revolution is on the order of the day. All humanity becomes divided more and more clearly into two great groups: on the one side, those who recognize the nature of the impending change and have the courage to help in promoting it--the revolutionists; on the other, those who want to evade or soften it, who want to reform and compromise and modernize--the ruling class and its various grades and categories of lackeys and flunkeys. The out-and-out revolutionists--those who are heartily sick of capitalism in all its distinctive manifestations, whether in peace or war, and whose main preoccupation is that of doing away with it in the shortest possible order--are as yet a comparatively very small group with well defined characteristics. We leave their portrait to be drawn by others. The portrait of the counter-revolution, on the other hand, is highly complex, reflecting the various shades of opposition or perfect conformability to the established order, but in which the twilight tints distinctly predominate. We have here established the four great categories: fascists, half-fascists, socialists and sheep. But even these terms are far from being mutually exclusive; the "sheep" particularly may easily be conceived as embracing them all.

We take up these categories in the order named, hoping that our remarks will serve to clarify them in a way to make them readily distinguishable, thoughat the same time realizing that there is considerable transfusion of one into the other, and that the fascist, say, of today may be the socialist of tomorrow, but more often the other way 'round.

The chief difficulty involved in getting a clear picture of the fascists is the hierarchization within their ranks. This is owing to the fact that fascism, in the final analysis, really emanates from above--from the ruling class-- and seeps down, or rather is poured down, into the masses, who lap it up in their daily newspaper as well as in their daily bread. It is probably true, as old Lloyd George has said, that "Scratch a conservative, and you will find a fascist". But some people are conservative out of interest, and others out of mere instinct or inertia. Thus, in the United States, the prime, if still only incipient, fascists are men like W.R.Heart and Henry Ford: the one furnishing, for the present, mainly the ideology and the other mainly the more material forms of seduction (wages, profit sharing, subsistence gardens, etc.). These are comparatively <u>intelligent</u> fascists; at least they know what they want

and are more or less successful in having it got for them. Insofar as they are still opposed to fascism--as, for example, to the fascist tendencies inherent in the Roosevelt administration (N. R. A.)--it is merely to the regimentation necessarily involved for the capitalists, to some extent, as well as for the workers. But the fascists with whom we are here concerned are of the much more numerous and humble variety: those who, even if they may know what they want, are not in a position to get it under the present system--except possibly at the cost of prostituting themselves completely--but who still find capitalism to their taste and believe in its possibilities, and who are determined to defend the system. This sort of fascist, who may be regarded as typical, can with perfect right take as his motto: "Duty toward others" The "others", however, whether he knows it or not, are the bourgeois-capitalist class of his own country.

Patriotism is the most distinctive characteristic of the true fascist. He not only believes in the innate superiority of his own country (or "race") over all others,but in the superiority of his own state, county, village.... He has all the savage's distrust of anything strange or foreign. Of course, on carrying this ideology to its logical conclusion, the fascist would also have to believe in his own superiority over all other human beings. But he seems to have a presentiment of the fact that this would be a reductio ad absurdum: the true fascist--of the humbler category--is neither a megalomaniac nor a solipsist; when in his patriotic fervor he gets down to himself, he quickly recoils and shifts his ego off onto the "leader", without whom there is nothing to be done. The leader on earth, and God in heaven are equally indispensable to the fascist: the one is simply the representative of the other. For this reason--the realization of his own insignificance--the true fascist can never be really irreligious; he can only be opposed to certain forms of religion or to certain sects, particularly to the Jews and Catholics as being tinged with internationalsim and hence evoking his horror of what is foreign.He needs particularly the belief in the soul and a future life, because this helps to assure him of his own superiority to the dogs, swine and other such animals who have never been able, so far as known, to set up any pretensions to immortality. In fact, the fascist is very likely to be afflicted with an inferiority complex, and his zeal in serving the ruling class is a natural outgrowth of that condition. He actually imagines that by putting himself <u>on the side</u> of the ruling class, he therefore <u>belongs</u> to it. The hundred-percent fascist is a very distinctive type of homo insipiens; just as he claims to be able always to smell a Jew, so it is very easy, if not to smell, at least to <u>spot</u> a fascist.

These fascists, however, are not particularly to be blamed, Their educational opportunities have usually been very limited--or neglected--and as a result of their more or less exclusive literary preoccupation with the newspapers, they have been thoroughly infected with the capitalist ideology. There is no possibility of "converting" them, except possibly by way of letting them see that being a revolutionist is a sign of superiority which it is within their power to attain. Otherwise, they are quite immune to communist propaganda, and retain their extreme susceptibility to the capitalist variety. This is on the assumption, however, that they still find it possible to live somehow under capitalism. If that becomes quite impossible, even by criminal means, then these fascists may furnish some of the best recruits to the revolutionary cause.

The half-fascist is chiefly distinguished from his "pure" brother by being a more intellectual, hence more sophisticated, specimen of the same type. He has read more or less and makes some pretentions to culture. He has accordingly shuffled off most of the prejudices of the fascist proper, and is more open to reason. His reading, however, has usually not been of a sort by which he could become really enlightened, but is chiefly of the conventional or academic variety. His education in economics has been particularly neglected, and his notions on the subject are of the most naive capitalist character. His favorite "economist" is very likely to be Stuart Chase (Mrs. Blue Bonnet) and he usually displays a weakness for "technocracy" and other such innocent pastimes. Marxism has remained quite beyond his ken, nor has he any inclinations in that direction. The most that he has a mind for is "literature" and other such more or less esthetic manifestations of the human ego. Theory and the theoreticians he finds dull and painful.

He is not, however, violently opposed to radicalism or anything else in particular. He prides himself on being broad-minded and tolerant--a tolerance which extends also to the more "idealistic" phases of fascism. His fascist tendency comes out chiefly in his reverence for the "strong man"--the unscrupulous wielder of power--and in his contempt for the masses. And yet the half-fascist would be mortally offended at the very suggestion that he might harbor a fascist streak. He looks upon himself as a liberal pure and simple. And "pure and simple" at least is correct; the half-fascist is pure and simple enough to read the ravings of a Spengler and to think that this is the last word in philosophy (and not merely that of the bourgeoisie), without suspecting that Spengler is only furnishing the ideology for fascism. Thus the half-fascist is a very half-and-half sort of person indeed, and whether when the time comes he jumps one way or the other will probably depend entirely on circumstances of the

moment or, as we say, on the constellation of forces.

Of all the counter-revolutionists, actual or potential, the most contemptible are, without doubt, the socialists. These, in the main, lack the excuse of ignorance which we readily grant to the fascists and half-fascists. They have mostly had at least some smattering of Marxism, as well as some political experience in the "labor movement", and have accordingly had an opportunity to know what capitalism is--its merits and its defects, its course and present stage of development--and to arrive at certain conclusions regarding the manner in which it is to be set aside. The circumstance that they still cling, in the main, to their dogma of non-violence--except in the interests of capitalism and against the workers themselves--can be explained only in terms of the most abject cowardice and the most brazen prostitution on the part of the leading spirits of the Second International. Deep down in their hearts, these old "labor leaders" know better, but they haven't the guts to admit it, even to themselves, much less to act in accordance with that recognition. Nor, as a matter of fact, is there any ground for expecting that they ever will. Fundamentally, the leaders of the old labor movement, not excluding the Bolsheviks (Stalinists, Leninists, Trotskyists and others still bound up with the traditions of the russian revolution), are nearly or quite as petty-bourgeois in their outlook as are the fascists and half-fascists. Even though they may shout for the proletarian dictatorship, they really have a horror of the thing itself. This is because they think, more or less unconsciously, in terms of bourgeois society, which they would like to see preserved as nearly as possible, and because of their social status and superior educational advantages (as compared with the workers) which they feel entitle them to special consideration in any form of society. So that even when a proletarian dictatorship is once established--as seemed likely to happen in Russia--these old labor politicians can be counted upon to put an end to it as quickly as possible, if they have the power. Not, however, in order to do away with dictatorship itself and to inaugurate the classless society, but in order to replace the proletarian dictatorship by a bourgeois dictatorship, at least in form (with themselves as the dictators) if not in actual substance (by turning the power back to the old ruling class, as in Germany after the war). They are all more or less like the late secretary of the british Labor Party, who frankly confessed to regarding the collapse of the present social and political order as a "terrible prospect".

We now come to the most curious of the counter-revolutionary forces, though these can hardly be rated as a "force" at all: the pure "sheep". These also are socialists of a sort--many of them actually profess to be such--but still more cowardly, more supine, more muddleheaded and more bourgeois. They may be said to constitute the lunatic fringe

of the socialist movement: the free-traders, the pacifists the currency cranks, the reformers pure and simple--in a word, the church-going socialists. They are the people who can never accept or reject a thing outright, but--if they find it uncomfortable or otherwise obnoxious--can only suggest amending it gradually or modernizing it. This applies to Capitalism no less than to Christianity. They can point to all sorts of evils and "injustices" under capitalism, but insist that they can all be remedied within the system itself; not only can, but naturally will be, provided only that everybody becomes as nice and sheep-like as themselves, which they hold to be quite possible as well as desirable. Likewise as regards religion: the Catholic Church is rotten, naturally, but Protestantism--or at any rate the sect to which they themselves belong (usually one of the "modernist" persuasion)--is just what the country and the world needs to set it right. They have never bothered with such subjects as economics; they prefer to read things of a morally edifying nature. And, in fact, they see all problems in terms of morality and the human will. Instead of economic laws and forces, to them there are only individuals or, at most, political parties. Socialism to them--in case they profess to be socialists--is merely a matter of putting the socialists (headed by another good churchman, such as Norman Thomas) in charge of the capitalist state apparatus. Thus an old socialist on examining a chart depicting the economic organization of Mussolini's kingdom, remarked: "It looks like a very good thing to be taken over when they put the right men in office".

Their economic and political innocence is such that socialism is practically nothing but fascism under a different name; that is, state capitalism. If the fascists call themselves socialists (or nationalsocialists, or anything el but fascists), and refrain from too much violence, they a assured in advance of the support of all these people. And after fascism is once established or gets into power, it may do as it likes and still retain their support or at least their passive acquiescence; for that is the nature of sheep, to be on the side of a ruling class and never aspire to be the masters of their own destinies.

These compromisers and modernizers and shilly-shallyers are, in a sense, the strongest bulwark of capitalism and the worst enemies in the way of the revolutionary movement and the reconstruction of society. Not because of their numbers (which are considerable enough) nor because of any power of attack or defense (which is practically nil), but rather because of their demoralizing influence, their fertility in conjuring up new hopes and illusions as an excuse for delay and inaction. Far better, from the revolutionary point of view, are the forthright reactionaries in politics or the absolute fundamentalists in religion than these pious sheep with their liberal tub-thumping.

They merely serve to confuse an issue which should be kept clear, and to delay a process which has every need of being accelerated.

****

Fortunately for the revolution and for the fate of humanity, world history is not determined by sheep, nor in times such as the present can the sheep continue long in their sheepishness. In the great majority of cases--and particularly among the workers--this sheepishness is only a superficial adaptation to the capitalist environment and will be quickly thrown off under the pressure of capitalist collapse. These working-class "sheep" will then undergo a metamorphosis no less remarkable than those recorded in fable, and will come forth as heroes; not the sham heroes of capitalist wars of destruction, but the true heroes of the communist revolution of creation and redemption, in which humanity sloughs the brute and at last comes into its birth-right.

And in the final result, it is only the workers who really count; not the timid, respectable philistines who try to excuse their own cowardice on the ground of the workers' alleged backwardness, for which the philistines and their idolized leaders are largely responsible. These petty-bourgeois poltroons who neveradvance beyond the stage of voting, and many of whom regard even that as an act of rare courage, are best characterized by Engels in "Revolution and Counter-Revolution", where, speaking of the small trading class, he says that it "never felt more comfortable than the day after a decisive defeat, when everything being lost, it had at least the consolation to know that somehow or other the matter was settled".

- G -

****

: : : : : : : : : : :

****

P A M P H L E T S :

"World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution"	10¢
" Bolshevism or Communism"	5¢
"What Next for the American Worker?"	10¢
"The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism"	10¢
"Marxism or Leninism".By Rosa Luxemburg	10¢
"The Inevitability of Communism"	25¢

Order from:
Council Correspondence -1604 N.California Ave. Chicago, Ill.

****

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

Contents:

On The War Question

Trade Unionism

Problems of the New Labor Movement

Vol. II **No. 2**

JANUARY 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

They merely serve to confuse an issue which should be kept clear, and to delay a process which has every need of being accelerated.

****

Fortunately for the revolution and for the fate of humanity, world history is not determined by sheep, nor in times such as the present can the sheep continue long in their sheepishness. In the great majority of cases--and particularly among the workers--this sheepishness is only a superficial adaptation to the capitalist environment and will be quickly thrown off under the pressure of capitalist collapse. These working-class "sheep" will then undergo a metamorphosis no less remarkable than those recorded in fable, and will come forth as heroes; not the sham heroes of capitalist wars of destruction, but the true heroes of the communist revolution of creation and redemption, in which humanity sloughs the brute and at last comes into its birth-right.

And in the final result, it is only the workers who really count; not the timid, respectable philistines who try to excuse their own cowardice on the ground of the workers' alleged backwardness, for which the philistines and their idolized leaders are largely responsible. These petty-bourgeois poltroons who neveradvance beyond the stage of voting, and many of whom regard even that as an act of rare courage, are best characterized by Engels in "Revolution and Counter-Revolution", where, speaking of the small trading class, he says that it "never felt more comfortable than the day after a decisive defeat, when everything being lost, it had at least the consolation to know that somehow or other the matter <u>was</u> settled".

- G -

****

: : : : : : : : : : :

****

<u>P A M P H L E T S :</u>

"World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution"	10¢
" Bolshevism or Communism"	5¢
"What Next for the American Worker?"	10¢
"The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism"	10¢
"Marxism or Leninism".By Rosa Luxemburg	10¢
"The Inevitability of Communism"	25¢

Order from:
Council Correspondence -1604 N.California Ave. Chicago, Ill.

****
******
*

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

Contents:

On The War Question

Trade Unionism

Problems of the New Labor Movement

Vol. II **No. 2**

JANUARY 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

∴ **Published at 1604 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois** ∴

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

Notes on the War Question

The problem of war, which has long been the object of so much discussion, has become a concrete question of the day thru the proceedings in Ethiopia. The enormous significance of this war lies in the fact that it illuminates as with a flash of lightning the general imperialistic rivalries and points to the inevitability of a new world slaughter. No thinking person seriously believes today that the war for the redistribution of the shares of profit can long be deferred any more, and the various nations are consciously making ready for this conflict. What the bourgeoisie and the various capitalist groups of interests have to say or conceal as to the war situation, we learn from their press; what they are doing in order that the war shall find them prepared is indicated by their arming manoeuvres and their "diplomacy".

The only thing that interests us here is the position to be taken on the war question by the revolutionary workers. First, in case the african war remains localized or is brought to an end thru imperialistic understandings before the world war breaks out; and secondly, what their position shall be in case the african adventure should presently develop into a new world war. The criterion for the position taken by us are the

real, international class interests of the proletariat. We have no desire either to defend the feudalistic regime in Abyssinia nor to justify fascist Italy nor to identify ourselves with the imperialistic interests of England; nor to confine ourselves, for lack of anything else to say, to the problems of the class struggle in the United States; nor thru the "maintenance of world peace" to preserve state-capitalist Russia from convulsion; nor to take up with the alliance policy of France against Germany (or the other way 'round). Our standpoint poses only the one question: what must, can and will the working class do?

The war--whether the one in Africa or the coming world war--has no other immediate significance for the workers than that a part of them will be killed off in the most revolting manner and that as a class, insofar as they are not slaughtered, they will be immeasurably impoverished. War, bringing death and misery to the workers, cannot from the working-class standpoint be bade welcome. But the preponderant working masses have today no class standpoint of their own; they are under the sway of the bourgeois ideology and follow the movements of their masters, willingly or unwillingly ready to suffer and die for them.

Our standpoint is not that of the working masses, but of a small part of their more or less class-conscious elements. We don't, however, damn the working class because of the circumstance that it is again making ready on an international scale to go under in millions for Capital. We realize that the ideas of a time are always those of the ruling class, and we know the objective as well as the subjective grounds which for the moment repress the revolutionary nature of the proletariat and which cause it to continue waging war for Capital, just as it also works for Capital.

The causes of the revolutionary unripeness of the proletariat shall not concern us at this place; we make these statements merely in order to draw the conclusion that the international working class will not in the near future thru revolutionary overturns put an end to capitalism and its wars. In this case there remains to the proletariat nothing other than to go along with capitalist policy; it has to decide for this or that capitalist group of interests and to fight for it.

What the proletariat would have to do in its own interest--that is, prevent the war--is possible only thru the revolutionary setting aside of capitalism. Still, the improbability of a revolution prior to the coming war makes the war certain already; and if the proletariat takes part in the war, it will do so not with a special

ideology, but that of its bourgeoisie. In such circumstances, the great mass of the workers will no doubt, just like the bourgeoisie, line up against revolutionists, and for these latter there will be for a time no other working possibility than such as exists under the present-day german fascism: the training and most careful selection of the revolutionists themselves, cautious increase of their numbers, and the endeavor to bring them alive thru the "dead time" (from the revolutionary standpoint), until the war has exhausted itself and has created the subjective ripeness for revolution. For if capitalist production has a revolutionizing character, so also has its destructive phase. If, in the course of its development, Capital shapes the greatest productive force, the proletariat, which is compelled to shatter the capitalist relations in order to consummate itself, --so in war it shapes, under the present conditions, a situation which, seen from any point of view, can only issue in the proletarian revolution.

While the last war had led almost to the door of the world revolution, this door will no doubt be opened by the new world war. For just as Capital is incapable of controlling production, which turns against it, so it is equally incapable of keeping destruction in forms and paths which offer the possibility of any desired diversion into "normal" situations. The magnitude and virulence of the coming war preclude its mastering by way of Capital. As in crisis, so also in war, Capitalism swims helpless in a sea of troubles; which is merely another confirmation of the fact that it is historically surpassed.

From the revolutionary point of view, war accelerates the advent of a truly revolutionary situation, and all forces will have to be properly directed to this factor. In unrevolutionary times, one need not, because of some silly idealistic fancies or other, lavish himself to no purpose, but will adjust his tactic and his will to the final struggle, which will be found in the wake of the war.

Capital pursues no social goals; there is today no "social will", but only particular strivings and groups of interests. Capital develops thru the sharpening of the conflicts of interests. If the number of these conflicts diminishes thru concentration, they become correspondingly harsher and more disintegrating. The more the conditions for a systematic social direction of economy from the technical and organizational standpoint are evolved, the more this possibility is precluded by reason of the persisting economic relations of present-day society. If economy cannot be planfully

organized even within the framework of a single nation, nor any peacefully regulated distribution of the shares of profit introduced, such a thing is still more thoroughly precluded on the international field. Necessary reorganizations, forced by reason of the sharpening contradiction between increasing productive forces and the persisting profit order (so as not to abolish the latter) can be brought about only by way of violence. If capital's concentration process and the crisis are means to the "extra-human" reorganization of profit economy--a reorganization determined by commodity fetishism--war likewise has no other significance. A capitalist war is not, however, always the same capitalist war. If the capitalist problem is one of creating additional surplus value, then a war which increases the profitability of capital may mean a way out of the capitalist difficulties and furnish the impulse for an accelerated advance. The war would here be a means of hastening the accumulation and would be followed not by revolutionary uprising but possibly by a general upswing. The fact that war always enriches only a few and impoverishes the mass under all circumstances is not the particular feature of war but the general tendency of the capitalist development. War itself does not create but destroys profit. It may, however, lead to the opening of new sources of profit which not only make up for the temporary loss but convert it into gain. War in this case is an accelerator for an otherwise slower movement. If war can accelerate accumulation, still on a higher stage of accumulation it is necessarily compelled to slow this accumulation down or, when it has come to a standstill, make its revival still more difficult. If the accelerated accumulation leads to over-accumulation and thereby to its arrest, it leads also to a situation in which the war must become a hindrance to further accumulation; a situation in which the war, instead of revealing new sources of profit, can continue to be conducted only for the sake of reorganizing the distribution of the profit internationally won and internationally determined. It is then a question not of increasing the profit and hence of overcoming the crisis, but of the altered distribution of the profit, in which connection the expenses of this process of distribution, the war costs, have to be set down as a pure loss by which the difficulties of capital are made more difficult.

The concentration of capital is, from the capitalist standpoint, progressive only in case there is a simultaneous growth of capital. Concentration without growth is only accelerated increase of the capitalist contradictions and difficulties. The character of the present crisis, as we have pointed it out (Council Correspondence, Vol 1, #2,) is not such as to permit of seeing in the coming world war a means of overcoming crisis.

The war can only deepen the crisis to a point at which the proletarian revolution must be released. But even though the war cannot be regarded as a means of overcoming the crisis, still there is capitalistically no possibility of preventing the war. If the profits can no longer be increased to conform to the further needs of accumulation, there remains to capital no other activity than the sharpened competitive struggle for the diminished or stagnating profit mass. The longer the crisis lasts, the more closely the war approaches. Though war most probably means the beginning of the capitalist end, still at the same time it is the only way out for capital, which can live only so long as it destroys. The paradoxical nature of this situation rests on the capitalist contradiction between exchange value and use value, on the fact that capital has to exercise production and destruction at the same time in order to exist at all. This is illustrated also in the increasing wealth of society with simultaneously decreasing profits, in the starving of human beings in the midst of superfluous products, etc.

We have said that if the proletariat cannot conduct an independent policy and if it fails to do so, then it can only come forth as an appendage of the bourgeoisie, with the interests of which it is compelled to conform. The african conflict presents an example of this fact The mass of the italian workers still stands on the side of Mussolini, as the mass of the german workers still stands behind Hitler (indifference amounts to supporting the bourgeoisie) and the mass of the english workers identifies itself with the interests of its bourgeoisie. Even the policy of the "official labor movement" is a mere reflection of capitalist necessities. The Second International has identified itself with the imperialist measures and plans of England against Italy. The policy of "sanctions", the support of the League of Nations, even the transport strike which has remained no more than a phrase, or the petition for the closing of the Suez Canal--whatever was recommended against the war promoters on the part of the labor movement were recommendations in the interest of english imperialism. And if the Second International came out for english imperialism, so in turn english imperialism has come out for the labor movement in its struggle against "Fascism", which it has attacked as an "inciter of wars" We live in a funny world. Both the Second International as well as english imperialism, naturally want to maintain peace, which maintains the privileges of english imperialism, but the programs selected to this end are practically declarations of war. The Second International is for the <u>english</u> "peace" and hence for the english war.

The french reformists were more cautious in their demands for sanctions; the interests of the English are not identical with those of France. France's support of the english policy is an involuntary one. The policy of the Second International with regard to the war situation is a repetition of its position during the previous war: it is driving the masses to the shambles in the interest of the bourgeoisie.

The position of the Third International, identical with Russia's attitude on the war, is outwardly a silly cry for peace. On the african situation, it scarcely ventures to take a position. Radek writes in the "Rundschau" (#57): "Thruout the world the working people are following this war, and wish for the abyssinian masses not only that they will not come under any colonial yoke, but also that in this great historical test they will rend asunder the chains of feudalism and of slavery at home". But even this pious wish of the Third International in the interest of abyssinian independence came rather late, since Russia, like France, has no desire to offend Italy if such can in any way be avoided. It was not until her french ally, considering that the time for the world war has not yet come, made half-way concessions to England that Russia also found herself in a position where it became advisable to emit a few weak-kneed protests against Italy's aggressions, without imposing any restrictions on the furnishing of Italy with raw materials necessary for war purposes.

If, in the opinion of the Third International, the workers should merely "follow" the war and in their hearts wish the Abyssinians luck, this is proof for the Trotskyists that Stalin has once more betrayed Leninism, for Lenin was of course for the unconditional support of all national movements and suppressed peoples. So then the "uncorrupted Leninists" write in "The New International" (Oct. 1935), without realizing how ridiculous they make themselves: "The position of neutrality of the international revolutionary proletariat we dismiss with a wave of the hand: if it is true that the revolutionary proletariat is for the defeat of Italy, when it is not neutral, then it is for the victory of Ethiopia. If it desires the victory of Ethiopia, then it must help to produce it. This means that it does not remain "neutral", but that it actively intervenes for Ethiopia." According to this conception, the most consistent revolutionists would be those who should join Haile Selassie's army and fight for him. Since, however, the trip to Africa costs money, one must after all confine himself to a few phrases which hurt nobody. Here are the concrete demands of the 200-percent Leninists: "Prevention of troop transports and of arms and munitions

supplies for Italy; support for arm supplies to Ethiopia· unambiguous, loud, fearless propaganda for the justness of the war from the ethiopian standpoint," etc. It never occurs to these people that the whole question of the "neutrality" of the proletariat, so hotly rejected, is no question at all. Either the proletariat fights with its bourgeoisie the war of the bourgeoisie, or else it makes revolution. These are the only two possibilities, and the possibility of a "neutral" attitude on the part of the proletariat does not exist. And so these people are merely tilting at their own fancies. Like parrots, they repeat leninist phrases which were revealed as humbug even during the last war. In the present-day imperialistic milieu there are no longer any national wars of liberation. Not much was lacking during the last war and Ethiopia would have gone in as a matter of self-interest. She was quite ready to take part in the imperialistic affray in order to profit by it. The feudal condition of the country does not preclude becoming involved in imperialistic policy. Only the lack of inner unity prevented at that time the participation of Ethiopia in the imperialist world war, as it today makes a struggle for "national liberation" or "independence" a silly phrase. Ethiopia is by no means a unified formation which takes up arms for its national independence, but a country disrupted by struggles of groups and interests; certain parts of which are ready to make common cause with Italy, while other parts prefer to continue exploiting their slaves by the grace of England. Within Ethiopia there are "suppressed nations" which line up against Haile Selassie just as Selassie does against Italy. So why not go still farther and carry the right of self-determination to Ethiopia itself, sabotage the ethiopian army and arm the suppressed tribes? Regardless of how zealously one may come out for the independence of Ethiopia, this "leninist principle" would always remain identical with support of the imperialist interests of England. It is about time that this silliest point of Leninism be thrown overboard, and one learns to realize that in the international field there are only two alternatives left today: either imperialist policy or -- working-class policy.

The abyssinian conflict has so far remained localized because the fronts for the coming world war are not yet drawn clearly enough. We see no use in considering here the question of when and with what combinations of powers the next war will occur and which of these combinations will have the best prospects. There is no imperialist country which has like-directed and unequivocal imperialistic interests; if only with the development of capital export, new oppositions of interests have taken form both on the international and the national planes, oppositions by which country and world

are divided into groups, some of which gain by peace and others of which profit from war. German fascism is actually being directed also against Capital, that is, against capitalist circles which are unable to identify themselves completely with the interests of the german imperialists. German as well as italian fascism have anticipated what had to wait until after the outbreak of the last war to be created; the coordinating war economy which passed for dictatorial subordination of all separate capitalist interests under the strongest imperialist interests, and which Lenin celebrated as state capitalism and the presupposition for socialism. Fascism is thus not merely an expression of the monopolistic concentration of economic policy, of the complete subordination of the workers under the profit needs of capital, but also a war measure for the new imperialistic conflicts. The objective unripeness of the war situation was illustrated in the japanese policy with regard to China, a policy which met with no real opposition among the other interested powers. The re-arming of Germany, the tearing up of the Versailles treaty, showed once more that a new world war requires first a reorientation of the various imperialisms. The isolation of the war in Africa merely points to the fact that this regrouping of imperialist interests is not yet completed. The war in Africa has so far given a new impetus only to diplomacy, the process of clarification, and only in this sense is it tied up with the coming world war.

The restraint on the part of England is to be understood only as preparation for war, just as the "neutrality" of Germany is identical with her re-arming and the vacillation of France is to be explained by the military unreadiness of Germany. A great number of surprises are still possible before the world war breaks out. It cannot be forseen as yet what groups of powers will stand opposed to other groups. The one thing that is clear is that rivalries of great magnitude, such as the one between England and the United States, will help in determining those of the other countries, and that the smaller rivalries can work themselves out only within the framework of the large ones. If japanese imperialism functions almost exclusively on the basis of the english-american opposition, so the european alliance policy is likewise adjusted to that opposition. In whatever particular manner the powers may line up (we shall come back to this point in a special article), the process of formation may last a few years longer, but it may also be decided all of a sudden. The war is possible tomorrow, but it may equally well be delayed a few years longer. Looked at from the class standpoint, the proletariat must answer the war with the revolution. No other answer is possible. Just as it can only save itself thru the overthrow of capital, so it must endeavor even today

to assure its own life and must fight against capital for its material interests. Sharpening of the class struggle in peace and in war is ever the correct watchword. So far as concerns the present war in Africa, it presents no special problem. The proletariat can only come out for itself, by which it comes out for humanity. It cannot come out for the "independence of Ethiopia". The backward peoples fight, when they fight, for the development of their national capitalism, because nothing else is possible. It cannot be the task of the proletariat to fight for new as against old capitalist nations; it has to overthrow world capitalism. The proletariat has no word for Ethiopia, since Ethiopia still has no proletariat. But the proletariat has a word for Italy and for all other capitalist countries: the overthrow of world capitalism, and therewith the end of imperialism. With the end of world capitalism there is taken away at the same time the possibility of capitalizing the backward countries. However complicated the colonial question may appear within the framework of capitalism, the position of the proletariat has to be limited to the simplest formula: the safeguarding of the class interests of the proletariat, and nothing else.

##################

PLEASE NOTICE

The United Workers Party has found it advisable to drop the party name. In view of the fact that the U.W.P. was not a "party" in the traditional sense, the retention of the word has led to a lot of needless misunderstandings. The name "United Workers Party" had been selected at a time --and then only as a temporary solution -- when the members of this organization were just beginning to find their present position. The new name, Groups of Council Communists, strikes us as a more accurate indication of our attitude, and all concerned are requested to note this change.

****

R E A D :

Raetekorrespondenz, (theoretisches- und Diskussionsorgan fuer die Raetebewegung). Herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationale Kommunisten (Holland). Einzelnummer 10¢. Order from: Council Correspondence-1604 N. California Ave. Chicago, Ill.

.....

T R A D E U N I O N I S M

How must the working class fight capitalism in order to win? This is the all important question facing the workers every day. What efficient means of action, what tactics can it use to conquer power and defeat the enemy? No science, no theory, could tell them exactly what to do. But spontaneously and instinctively, by feeling out, by sensing the possibilities, they found their ways of action. And as capitalism grew and conquered the earth and increased its power, the power of the workers also increased. New modes of action, wider and more efficient, ame up beside the old ones. It is evident that the changing conditions, the forms of action, the tactics of the class struggle have to change also. Trade unionism is the primary form of labor movement in fixed capitalism. The isolated worker is powerless against the capitalistic employer. To overcome this handicap, the workers organized into unions. The union binds the workers together into common action, with the strike as their weapon. Then the balance of power is relatively equal, or is some times even heaviest on the side of the workers, so that the isolated small employer is weak against the mighty union. Hence in developed capitalism trade unions and employer's unions (Associations, Trusts, Corporations, etc.),stand as fighting powers against each other.

Trade uinonism first came up in England, where industrial capitalism first developed. Afterward it spread to other countries, as a natural companion of capitalist industry. In the United States there were very special conditions. In the beginning, the abundance of free unocupied land, open to settlers, made a shortage of workers in the towns and relatively high wages and good conditions. The American Federation of Labor became a power in the country, and generally was able to uphold a relatively high standard of living for the workers who were organized in unions.

It is clear that under such conditions the idea of overthrowing capitalism could not for a moment arise in the minds of the workers. Capitalism offered them a sufficient and fairly secure living. They did not feel themselves a separate class whose interests were hostile to the existing order; they were part of it; they were conscious of partaking in all the possibilities of an ascending capitalism in a new continent. There was room for millions of people, coming mostly from Europe. For these increasing millions of farmers, a rapidly increasing industry was necessary, where, with energy and good

luck, workmen could rise to free artisans, to small business men, even to rich capitalists. It is natural that here a true capitalist spirit prevailed in the working class.

The same was the case in England. Here it was due to England's monopoly of world commerce and big industry, to the lack of competitors on the foreign markets, and to the possessions of rich colonies, which brought enormous wealth to England. The capitalist class had no need to fight for its profits and could allow the workers a reasonable living. Of course, at the first, fighting was necessary to urge this truth upon them; but then they could allow unions and grant wages in exchange for industrial peace. So here the working class was also imbued with the capitalist spirit.

Now this is entirely in harmony with the innermost character of trade unionism. Trade unionism is an action of the workers, which does not go beyond the limit of capitalism. Its aim is not to replace capitalism by another form of production, but to secure good living conditions within capitalism. Its character is not revolutionary, but conservative.

Certainly, trade union action is class struggle. There is a class antagonism in capitalism--capitalists and workers have opposing interests. Not only on the question of conservation of capitalism, but also within capitalism itself, with regard to the division of the total product. The capitalists attempt to increase their profits, the surplus value, as much as possible, by cutting down wages and increasing the hours or the intensity of labor. On the other hand, the workers attempt to increase their wages and to shorten their hours of work. The price of his labor power is not a fixed quantity, though it must exceed a certain hunger minimum; and it is not paid by the capitalist of his own free will. Thus this antagonism becomes the object of a contest, the real class struggle. It is the task, the function of the trade unions to carry on this fight.

Trade unionism was the first training school in proletarian virtue, in solidarity as the spirit of organized fighting. It embodied the first form of proletarian organized power. In the early English and American trade unions this virtue often petrified and degenerated into a narrow craft-corporation, a true capitalistic state of mind. It was different, however, where the workers had to fight for their very existence, where the utmost efforts of their unions could hardly uphold their standard of living, where the full force of an energetic, fighting and expanding capitalism attacked them. There they had to learn the wisdom that only the revolution could de-

finitely save them.

So there comes a disparity between the working class and trade unionism. The working class has to look beyond capitalism. Trade unionism lives entirely within capitalism and cannot look beyond it. Trade unionism can only represent a part, a necessary but narrow part, in the class struggle. And it developes aspects which bring it into conflict with the greater aims of the working class.

With the growth of capitalism and big industry,the unions too must grow. They become big corporations with thousands of members, extending over the whole country,having sections in every town and every factory. Officials must be appointed: presidents, secretaries, treasurers, to conduct the affairs, to manage the finances, locally and centrally. They are the leaders, who negotiate with the capitalists and who by this practice have acquired a special skill. The president of a union is a big shot, as big as the capitalist employer himself, and he discusses with him on equal terms, the interests of his members.The officials are specialists in trade union work, which the members, entirely occupied by their factory work cannot judge or direct themselves.

So large a corporation as a union is not simply an assembly of single workers; it becomes an organized body, like a living organism, with its own policy, its own character, its own mentality, its own traditions, its own functions. It is a body with its own interests, which are separate from the interests of the working class. It has a will to live and to fight for its existence. If it should come to pass that unions were no longer necessary for the workers, then they would not simply disappear. Their funds, their members, and their officials, all these are realities that will not disappear at once, but continue their existence as elements of the organization.

The union officials, the labor leaders, are the bearers of the special union interests. Originally workmen from the shop, they acquire, by long practice at the head of the organization, a new social character. In each social group, once it is big enough to form a special group,the nature of its work, molds and determines its social character, its mode of thinking and acting. Their function is entirely different from that of the workers. They do not work in factories, they are not exploited by capitalists, their existence is not threatened continually by unemployment. They sit in offices, in fairly secure positions. They have to manage corporation affairs and to speak at workers meetings and discuss with employers. Of course, they have to stand for the workers, and to defend their interests and wishes against the capitalists. This is,

however, not very different from the position of the lawyer who, appointed secretary of an organization, will stand for its members and defend their interests to the full of his capacity.

However, there is a difference. Because many of the labor leaders came from the ranks of the workers, they have experienced for themselves what wage slavery and exploitation means. They feel as members of the working class and the proletarian spirit often acts as a strong tradition in them. But the new reality of their life continually tends to weaken this tradition. Economically they are not proletarians any more. They sit in conferences with the capitalists, bargaining over wages and hours, pitting interests against interests, just as the opposing interests of the capitalist corporations are weighted one against the other. They learn to understand the capitalist's position just as well as the worker's position; they have an eye for "the needs of industry"; they try to mediate. Personal exceptions occur, of course, but as a rule they cannot have that elementary class feeling of the workers, that does not understand and weigh capitalist interests over against their own, but will fight for their proper interests. Thus they get into conflict with the workers.

The labor leaders in advanced capitalism are numerous enough to form a special group or class with a special class character and interests. As representatives and leaders of the unions they embody the character and the interests of the unions. The unions are necessary elements of capitalism, so the leaders feel as necessary items, as most useful citizens in capitalist society. The capitalist functions of unions is to regulate class conflicts and to secure industrial peace. So labor leaders see it as their duty as citizens to work for industrial peace and mediate in conflicts. The test of the union lies entirely within capitalism; so labor leaders do not look beyond it. The instinct of self-preservation the will of the unions to live and to fight for existence, is embodied in the will of the labor leaders to fight for the existence of the unions. Their own existence is indissolubly connected with the existence of the unions. This is not meant in a petty sense, that they only think of their personal jobs when fighting for the unions. It means that primary necessities of life and social functions determine opinions. Their whole life is concentrated in the unions, only here have they a task. So the most necessary organ of society, the only source of security and power is to them the unions; hence it must be preserved and defended with all possible means. Even when the realities of capitalist society undermine this position, This capitalism does, when with its expansion class conflicts become sharper.

The concentration of capital in powerful concerns and their connection with big finance renders the position of the capitalist employers much stronger than the workers. Powerful industrial magnates are reigning as monarchs over large masses of workers, they keep them in absolute subjection and do not allow "their" men to go into unions.Now and then the heavily exploited wage slaves break out in revolt, in a big strike. They hope to enforce better terms, shorter hours, more human conditions, the right to organize. Union organizers come to aid them. But then the capitalist masters use their social and political power. The strikers are driven from their homes; they are shot by militia or hired thugs; their spokesmen are railroaded into jail; their relief actions are prohibited by court injunctions. The capitalist press denounces their cause as disorder, murder and revolution; public opinion is aroused against them. Then, after months of standing firm and of heroic suffering,exhausted by misery and disappointment, unable to impress the capitalist steel structure, they have to submit and to postpone their claims to more opportune times.

In the trades where unions exist as mighty organizations, their position is weakened by this same concentration of capital. The large funds they had collected for strike support are insignificant in comparison to the money power of their adversaries. A couple of lock-outs may completely drain them. No matter how hard the capitalist employer presses upon the worker by cutting wages and intensifying their hours of labor, the union cannot wage a fight. When tariffs have to be renewed, the union feels itself the weaker party. It has to accept the bad terms the capitalists offer; no skill in bargaining avails. But now the trouble with the rank and file members begins, The men want to fight; it will not submit before they have fought; and they have not much to lose by fighting. The leaders, however, have much to lose - the financial power of the unions, perhaps its existence. They try to avoid the fight, which they consider hopeless. They have to convince the men that it is better to come to terms. So,in the final analysis, they must act as spokesmen of the employers to force the capitalists' terms upon the workers. It is even worse when the workers insist on fighting, in opposition to the decision of the unions. Then the union's power must be used as a weapon to subdue the workers.

So the labor leader has become the slave of his capitalistic task of securing the industrial peace - now at the cost of the workers, though he meant to serve them as best he could. He cannot look beyond capitalism,and within the horizon of capitalism with a capitalist outlook,he is right when he thinks that fighting is of no use. The

criticism can only mean that trade unionism stands here at the limit of its power.

Is there another way out then? Could the workers win anything by fighting? Probably they will lose the immediate issue of the fight; but they will gain something else. By not submitting without having fought, they rouse the spirit of revolt against capitalism. They proclaim a new issue. But here the whole working class must join in. To the whole class, to all their fellow workers, they must show that in capitalism there is no future for them, and that only by fighting, not as a trade union, but as a class unity, they can win. This means the beginning of a revolutionary struggle. And when their fellow workers understand this lesson, when simultaneous strikes break out in other trades, when a wave of rebellion goes over the country, then in the arrogant hearts of the capitalists there may appear some doubt as to their omnipotence and some willingness to make concessions.

The trade union leader does not understand this point of view, because trade unionism cannot reach beyond capitalism. He opposes this kind of fight. Fighting capitalism in this way, means at the same time rebellion against the trade unions. The labor leader stands beside the capitalist in their common fear for the workers rebellion.

When the trade unions fought against the capitalist class for better working conditions, the capitalist class hated them, but it had not the power to completely destroy them. If the trade unions would try to raise all the forces of the working class in their fight, the capitalist class would persecute them with all its means. They may see their actions repressed as rebellion, their offices destroyed by militia, their leaders thrown in jail and fined, their funds confiscated. On the other hand, if they keep their members from fighting, the capitalist class may consider them as valuable institutions, to be preserved and protected; and their leaders as deserving citizens. So the trade unions find themselves between the devil and the deep sea; on the one side persecution, which is a tough thing to bear for people who meant to be peaceful citizens; on the other side, the rebellion of the members, which may undermine the unions The capitalist class, if it is wise, will recognize that a bit of sham fighting must be allowed to uphold the influence of the labor leaders over the members.

The conflict arising here are not anyone's fault; they are an inevitable consequence of capitalistic development. Capitalism exists, but it is at the same time on the way to perdition. It must be fought as a living thing, and at the same time, as a transitory thing. The workers must wage a steady fight for wages and working

conditions, while at the same time communistic ideas, more or less clear and conscious, awaken in their minds. They cling to the unions, feeling that these are still necessary, trying now and then to transform them into better fighting institutions. But the spirit of trade unionism, which is in its pure form a capitalist spirit, is not in the workers. The divergence between these two tendencies in capitalism and in the class struggle appears now as a rift between the trade union spirit, mainly embodied in their leaders, and the growing revolutionary feeling of the members. This rift becomes apparent in the opposite position they take in various important social and political questions/

Trade unionism is bound to capitalism; it has its best chances to obtain good wages when capitalism flourishes. So in times of depression it must hope that prosperity will be restored, and it must try to further it. To the workers as a class, the prosperity of capitalism is not at all important. When it is weakened by crisis or depressions, they have the best chance to attack it, to strengthen the forces of the revolution and to take the first steps toward freedom.

Capitalism extends its dominion over foreign continents, seizing their natural treasures in order to make big profits. It conquers colonies, subjugates the primitive population and exploits them, often with horrible cruelties. The working class denounces colonial exploitation. amd opposes it, but trade unionism often supports colonial politics as a way to capitalist prosperity.

With the enormous increase of capital in modern times, colonies and foreign countries are being used as places in which to invest large sums of capital. They become valuable possessions as markets for big industry and as producers of raw materials. A race for getting colonies, a fierce conflict of interests over the dividing of the world arises between the great capitalist states. In these politics of imperialism the middle classes are whirled along in a common exultation of national greatness. Then the trade unions side with the master class, because they consider the prosperity of their own national capitalism to be dependent on its success in the imperialist struggle. For the working class, imperialism means increasing power and brutality of their exploiters.

These conflicts of interests between the national capitalisms explodes into wars. World war is the crowning of the policy of imperialism. For the workers, war is not only the destroying of all their feelings of international brotherhood, it also means the most violent exploitation of their class for capitalist profit. The working class, as the most numerous and the most oppres-

sed class of society, has to bear all the horrors of war. The workers have to give not only their labor power, but also their health and their lives.

Trade unionism, however, in war must stand upon the side of the capitalist. Its interests are bound up with national capitalism, the victory of which it must wish with all its heart. Hence it assists in arousing strong national feelings and national hatred. It helps the capitalist class to drive the workers into war and to beat down all opposition.

Trade unionism abhors communism. Communism takes away the very basis of its existence. In communism, in the absence of capitalist employers, there is no room for the trade union and labor leaders. It is true that in countries with a strong socialist movement, where the bulk of the workers are socialists, the labor leaders must be socialists too, by origin as well as by environment. But then they are right-wing-socialists; and their socialism is restricted to the idea of a commonwealth, where instead of greedy capitalists, honest labor leaders will manage industrial production.

Trade unionism hates revolution. Revolution upsets all the ordinary relations between capitalists and workers In its violent clashings, all those careful tariff regulations are swept away; in the strife of its gigantic forces the modest skill of the bargaining labor leaders loses its value. With all its power, trade unionism opposes the ideas of revolution and communism.

This opposition is not without significance. Trade unionism is a power in itself. It has considerable funds at its disposal, as material element of power. It has its spiritual influence, upheld and propagated by its periodical papers as mental element of power. It is a power in the hands of the leaders, who make use of it wherever the special interests of trade unions come into conflict with the revolutionary interests of the working class. Trade unionism, though built up by the workers and consisting of workers, has turned into a power over and above workers. Just as government is a power over and above the people.

The forms of trade unionism are different for different countries, owing to the different forms of development in capitalism. Nor do they always remain the same in every country. When they seem to be slowly dying away, the fighting spirit of the workers sometimes is able to transform them, or to build up new types of unionism. Thus in England, in the years 1880-90, the "new unionism" sprang up from the masses of poor dockers and the other badly paid, unskilled workers, bringing a new

spirit into the old craft unions. It is a consequence of capitalist development, that in founding new industries and in replacing skilled labor by machine power, it accumulates large bodies of unskilled workers, living in the worst of conditions. Forced at last into a wave of rebellion, into big strikes, they find the way to unity and class consciousness. They mould unionism into a new form, adapted to a more highly developed capitalism. Of course, when afterwards capitalism grows to still mightier forms, the new unionism cannot escape the fate of all unionism, and then it produces the same inner contradictions.

The most notable form sprang up in America, in the "Industrial Workers of the World." The I. W. W. originated from two forms of capitalist expansion. In the enormous forests and plains of the West, capitalism reaped the natural riches by Wild West methods of fierce and brutal exploitation; and the worker-adventurers responded with as wild and jealous a defense. And in the Eastern States new industries were founded upon the exploitation of millions of poor immigrants, coming from countries with a low standard of living and now subjected to sweatshop labor or other most miserable working conditions.

Against the narrow craft spirit of the old unionism, of the A.F. of L., which divided the workers of one industrial plant into a number of separate unions, the I.W.W. put the principle: all workers of one factory as comrades against one master, must form one union, to act as a strong unity against the employer. Against the multitude of often jealous and bickering trade unions, the I.W.W. set up the slogan: one big union for all the workers. The fight of one group is the cause of all. Solidarity extends over the entire class. Contrary to the haughty disdain of the well-paid old American skilled labor towards the unorganized immigrants, it was these worst paid proletarians that the I.W.W. led into the fight. They were too poor to pay high fees and build up ordinary trade unions. But when they broke out and revolted in big strikes, it was the I.W.W. who taught them how to fight; who raised relief funds all over the country; and who defended their cause in its papers and before the courts. By a glorious series of big battles it infused the spirit of organization and self-reliance into the hearts of these masses. Contrary to the trust in the big funds of the old unions, the Industrial Workers put their confidence in the living solidarity and the force of endurance, upheld by a burning enthusiasm. Instead of the heavy stone-masoned buildings of the old unions, they represented the flexible construction, with a fluctuating membership, contracting in time of peace, swelling and growing in the fight itself. Contrary to the conservative capitalist spirit of trade unionism, the Industrial Workers were anti-capital-

ist and stood for Revolution. Therefore they were persecuted with intense hatred by the whole capitalist world. They were thrown into jail and tortured on false accusations; a new crime was even invented on their behalf: that of "criminal syndicalism".

Industrial unionism alone as a method of fighting the capitalist class is not sufficient to overthrow capitalist society and to conquer the world for the working class. It fights the capitalists as employers on the economic field of production, but it has not the means to overthrow their political stronghold, the state power. Nevertheless, the I.W.W. so far has been the most revolutionary organization in America. More than any other it has contributed to rouse class consciousness and insight, solidarity and unity in the working class, to turn its eyes toward communism, and to prepare its fighting power.

The lesson of all these fights is that against big capitalism, trade unionism cannot win. And if at times it wins, such victories give only temporary relief. And yet, these fights are necessary and must be fought. To the bitter end? - no, to the better end.

The reason is obvious. An isolated group of workers against an isolated capitalist employer, might make equal parties. But an isolated group of workers against an employer, backed by the whole capitalist class, is powerless. And such is the case here: the state power, the money power of capitalism, public opinion of the middle class, excited by the capitalist press, all attack the group of fighting workers.

But does the working class back the strikers? The millions of other workers do not consider this fight as their own cause. Certainly they sympathize, and often collect money for the strikers, and this may give some relief, provided its distribution is not forbidden by a judge's injunction. But this easy-going sympathy leaves the real fight to the striking group alone. The millions stand aloof, passive. So the fight cannot be won (except in some special cases, when the capitalists, for business reasons, prefer to grant concessions), because the working class does not fight as one undivided unit.

The matter will be different, of course, when the mass of the workers really consider such a contest as directly concerning them; when they find that their own future is at stake. If they go into the fight themselves and extend the strike to other factories, to ever more branches of industry. Then the state power, the capitalist power, has to be divided and cannot be used entirely against the separate group of workers. It has to face the

collective power of the working class.

Extension of the strike, ever more widely, up to a general strike in the end, has often been advised as a means to avert a defeat. But to be sure, this is not to be taken as a truly expedient pattern, accidently hit upon, and ensuring victory. If such were the case, trade unions certainly would have made of it repeatedly as regular tactics. It cannot be proclaimed at will by union leaders, as a simple tactical measure. It must come forth from the deepest feelings of the masses, as the expression of their spontaneous initiative; and this is aroused only when the issue of the fight is or grows larger than a simple wage contest of one group. Only then the workers will put all their force, their enthusiasm, their solidarity, their power of endurance into it.

And all these forces they will need. For capitalism also will bring into the field stronger forces than before. It may have been defeated and taken by surprise by the unexpected exhibition of proletarian force and thus have made concessions. But then afterwards, it will gather new forces out of the deepest roots of its power and proceed to win back its position. So the victory of the workers is neither lasting nor certain. There is no clear and open road to victory; the road itself must be hewn and built through the capitalist jungle at the cost of immense efforts.

But even so, it will mean great progress. A wave of solidarity has gone through the masses, they have felt the immense power of class unity, their self-confidence is raised, they have shaken off the narrow group egotism. Through their own deeds they have acquired new wisdom: what capitalism means and how they stand as a class against the capitalist class. They have seen a glimpse of their way to freedom.

Thus the narrow field of trade union struggle widens into the broad field of class struggle. But now the workers themselves must change. They have to take a wider view of the world. From their trade, from their work within the factory walls, their mind must widen to encompass society at large. Their spirit must rise above the petty things around them. They have to face the state; they enter the realms of politics. The problems of revolution must be dealt with.

J. H.

* * * * *
* * * * * * * * *
* * * * *

PROBLEMS OF THE NEW LABOR MOVEMENT

In August 1935 the Council Correspondence published an article by our dutch comrades, dealing with the rise of a new labor movement and which was to serve as the basis of a discussion for the reorientation of the working class. The September number of the C.C. contained a series of theses which had been adopted by an international conference of council-communist groups held in Brussels. The October number of the C.C. brought out some critical remarks on the first-mentioned article, The Rise of a New Labor Movement, which were written by H.W., a member of a council-communist organization whose standpoint is very similar to ours. Finally, we published in the C.C. a reply of the dutch comrades to the Brussels theses. A large number of letters have reacheu us, dealing either with the Brussels conference or with H.W.'s disquisitions, as well as with the article of the dutch group. The points of view set forth in the correspondence were those which had already been expressed in the earlier contributions to the discussion as published in the C.C.; their publication could therefore be dispensed with. The Groups of Council Communists of America have stated in the last number of the C.C. that they could not be satisfied with the discussion to date, and are now presenting their own ideas on the subject, tho in regrettably condensed form. This is not, however, the end of the discussion; in further numbers of this periodical we shall again take up these questions in more detailed as well as more definite manner.

I

The work of the dutch group on "The Rise of a New Labor Movement" confines itself to a compendium of the general and essential principles of the council-communist movement. If one regards it as nothing more than this , it can no doubt be accepted with slight reservations. Still, one is then compelled at the same time to work out or convert the general principles into serviceable and concrete directives, in which connection the general principles must undergo more or less important modifications if they are not to be regarded as a utopian abstraction and lose all value.

"We too are convinced that the old labor movement is objectively surpassed, however much the heads of a lot of workers may still be afflicted by its ideologies. Since there is no possibility of realizing its ideas, it is only a question of time until the old labor move-

Due to an error pages 22-26 got mixed up; in reading, please follow strictly page numbers.

of organization. During the spontaneous uprisings, committees of action (councils) take form, since the forming of anything else is out of the question; and these represent the organization of any struggle whatsoever, and their fate depends on the development of this struggle. The extension of the struggle is at the same time the unfolding and centralizing of the council organization. A defeat may destroy it, until a new outbreak again brings it into existence. The necessarily small labor groups under the conditions of illegality can at most exercise influence upon these spontaneous organizations, never determine or directly lead them. Their activity has to be carried on within the councils as they arise, and not as a special organization by the side of these latter. Under the conditions of the dictatorship of Capital they can only exist at all as a special organization when they are so small that they are incapable of becoming the decisive factor of the revolution. They form, as a matter of fact, only the conscious element in the compulsory action of the masses. But even tho we decline to overrate the ideologically conscious element of the revolution, it has to be furthered. The greater the number of workers who know what is to be done, the better for the revolution; but their number will never be sufficient to direct the overturn all by themselves. The councils remain the determining factor. The more clearly these councils recognize their tasks, the more radically will the revolution be carried thru. The conscious element must work in the councils, and not attempt to impose their policies on them from the outside.

What holds for the revolution, holds also for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The workers have no more need of a special machinery of suppression than they have of a special political organization by the side of the councils. (The special political organization is, after all, only an indication of the unripeness of the revolutionary situation - an indication of the impossibility of the overthrow of capitalism.) The councils must alone have the economic and political instruments of power in their hands -- and in fact they have those instruments, provided that they do not voluntarily turn them over to a special body. The existence of two different centers of power can only lead to the elimination of one or the other. The councils organize the dictatorship, as later on they also organize production and distribution. They can not tolerate a special power beside themselves, for such a condition is a sure sign of their future impotence. The councils can only assert themselves and become the basis of the social organzation when they can assert themselves as the exclusive instrument of power. "All power to the councils" is not

ment as a council movement is the yardstick with which the consious application of the class forces can be measured". The idea that the workers' councils arise only in the revolution itself, we too reject. In any movement proceeding from the working class the main emphasis must be laid on the formation of workers' councils. The significance of a mass movement does not consist so much in the material successes which it attains, but in whether and to what extent it succeeds in applying the class forces thru its councils.

The labor movement which is consciously interested in the development of the movement of labor and which can be denoted as new we too regard as composed of those still very small groups " which see the essential part of the struggle for emancipation in the independent movement of the masses"; the goal of whose striving is not the power for themselves, but for the class, not party power but council power. H.W. too, in his critical remarks, shares our conception, and takes a different position for the first time in his treatment of the relation of the organized labor movement to the mass movements. Of course, it is only in case the arguments of the dutch group are to be regarded as a concrete analysis of the present-day situation --which apparently is not the case-- that they are open to H. W.'s reproach of not being concrete. As a "broad perspective" capable of dispensing with more detailed treatment, that analysis has its validity.

Furthermore, to H.W. , the exposition of the dutch group regarding the mass movement were rendered "obscure" for the reason that they are not concerned with bringing forth a new "organizational apparatus", but a new "vital principle". We too regard this substitution of a "vital principle" as very much out of order. One need not always seek for something with which to replace things which one has recognized as no longer serviceable. Things are not replaced; they disappear, and new ones take form. We agree with H.W. that "any class struggle and any mastery of society is impossible without suitable organization", and we see in this "vital principle" of the dutch group nothing more than new organizational forms. The councils are the organization of the revolution and that of the new society after their victory. Though prior to the revolution they may be possible only temporarly, take form and again disappear, and have no possibility of developng a permanent apparatus, still after the taking over of power as well as in the actual revolutionary process they become the machinery of social organization. Under the capitalist dictatorship,--the ground of the proletarian revolution,--the working class has no possibility of shaping for itself revolutionary, permanent forms

sense of the class movement; it is of practical importance only in the narrower sense of the relation of the working-class organizations to the class struggle. The revolutionary as well as the indifferent worked for Capital, the ones willingly, the others against their will. The ones carried on the struggle against Capital, the others went along with Capital. One group waited for wage increases, the other struck for them. Both these attitudes were possible only because wage increases were possible and necessary and were in conformity with the interests of Capitalism, however strongly resisted by the individual capitalist. Reformism, even when it was aggressive and denoted the attained stage of proletarian class struggle, had to move within a capitalism the end of which was beyond the range of vision -- except in theory, which must first become actuality in order to seize the masses. The indifferent workers merely sought to safeguard their advantages and interests in another and cheaper manner --precisely by means of their indifference-- since they were still less in a position to see beyond the mighty capitalist system. The proletarian class itself is a product of Capital; it forms and grows with the growth of Capital, it is weak and becomes stronger; in the up and down of capitalist economy it is compelled to activity and made passive; it acts revolutionary and reactionary out of necessity. But in all situations it is constantly present "in itself" and endeavors to act "for itself". One would do better, instead of making use of these limited formulas, to investigate the grounds by which the working class in different situations is moved in one case to take a revolutioanry stand and in another to remain completely passive. But the passivity also is a form of action and invalidates the formulation in question, which has to restrict itself to the comparatively meaningless ideological attitude of the workers in order to justify itself at all. In reality, the class is never "lifeless", tho it often lives on its inactivity. From the isolated standpoint of ideological maturity one may work with formulas, but such a procedure does not suffice for characterizing the whole class movement.

II

With the other sections of the article on the rise of a new labor movement we are, on the whole, in agreement, and we refrain from repeating the points there brought out, in which our own views are embraced. We are in accord with the dutch group when it states that the "movement of labor assumes in the workers' councils the form whereby it is in a position to master the social forces". And to us also " the growth of the mass move-

front, is fashioned by way of the capitalist conditions themselves.

In order to make clear the development of class consciousness, the dutch comrades adopted the formulation of the class " in itself" and the class "for itself", concepts such as had been employed by Marx and others. The use of such distinguishing methodological formulas for facilitating the understanding of many-sided problems does not, however, do away with the many-sidedness itself. And, for that matter , we read further: "Naturally, there is no complete and unbridgeable opposition between the class 'in itself' and the'class for itself';"In reality, however, there is not even an incomplete opposition of this nature. The class is at any time both 'in itself' and 'for itself'; it merely expresses itself differently in different situations and at the different stages of its development. Its possibilities and necessities change, and thereby its tasks and its attitudes. From the viewpoint of proletarian consciousness in the sense of ideology, the class exists only 'in itself' when it renounces the representing of its specific class interests and apathetically follows Capital. The indifference of the working class with respect to its real necessities surely does not abolish it as a class. But it has no obviously revolutionary character; it exists apparently not yet for itself, but for Capital. To the dutch comrades , it then exists "like any lifeless thing, hence passively." "As a living, active being" it exists, as they see it, only when it "comes into motion and to the consciousness of itself". H.W. in his criticism of this viewpoint (C.C. Vol.I;# 12) points out correctly that it is false to denote the working class as a lifeless thing. "For the working class even today is a quite 'active' force in the social development .... This 'activity' has a quite determinate, even tho conservative, effect in capitalist reality. A revolutionary passive class is not a "lifeless thing"; tho it is true that its activity is, in the first place, relatively weak and , secondly, goes in a direction which does not consciously lead to communist struggle. Unconsciously, however, even a reformist policy in which class interests are represented contributes a certain social propulsion and drives things forward." If one conceives class-consciousness not only as ideology, but still more as the workers' acting initiative, born of necessity, then the class always exists 'in itself' and 'for itself' at the same time. It was only because 'enlightened ' workers stood over against the indifferent masses that the old labor movement was able, of course, to identify the conscious part with the entire class. But this difference of ideology does not mean much in the broader

ment has disappeared from the mind as well, or until it has reached also its subjective end. The passing of the old labor movement as a tradition and as a tilting at wind-mills depends on so many different and yet interdependent factors that the point of time for it can not be definitely fixed. Our only consolation on this point is the certainty of the objective untenability of those ideas and impossibility of objective retrogression, as well as the tempo of capitalist decline, which of course is no less rapid than the capitalist upswing. The momentum attained by the capitalist movement as a result of the previous development precludes for the further development any long and relatively static periods.

We further share the view of the dutch comrades regarding the reasons of the present impotence of the labor movement and regarding its decline by reason of this impotence. The old labor movement is not only no match for the power of capital, but has itself become a part and expression of this capitalist power. The capitalist class must be opposed by the class front of the proletariat. The organized labor movement was neither interested in the forming of a genuine class front nor, even if it had been so, would have been capable of such a thing. It constantly championed group interests, and it was only to such conflicts that the movement was organizationally adapted. The end of the old labor movement was necessarily involved with the capital concentration in the decline of capitalism. The class struggle against the capitalist system, and in its most radical form, has thus become the only objective possibility.

Even tho the source of reformism - the capitalist upswing- was dried up, and the capitalist decline mirrored only the unavoidable end of the reformist movement, it was still possible to live for a time on reformist propaganda. The possibility of organization without the possibility of reform gave rise also to the neo-reformism of post-war time, until fascism came to look upon the existence of even the most incompetent working -class organizations as burdensome and dangerous, and set them aside. The indirect subordination of the workers to the interests of Capital by means of reformism has been followed by the direct subordination thru fascism. So that one may no doubt say with the dutch comrades that the organized labor movement as hitherto existing has found its historical end. It can not be formed anew. The thing with which we are concerned, in connection with the coming revolutionary conflicts, is the movement of labor. This movement of labor, which already represents the class

an empty phrase, but inexorable necessity. Any deviation from this principle is a step toward the emasculation of the councils and thereby to putting obstacles in the way of the communist struggle.

As to whether we shall succeed, --we are, of course, only a part of the working class, and without special interests, -- in putting our principle into pratice in its pure form: that is a question by which the principle itself is not affected. One does not always attain the thing that he aims for. But because too many opposite forces work counter to the objectively possible goal -- forces which may succeed in turning the goal aside -- it is well for that very reason to hold unwaveringly to the maximal program. If by reason of the situation the councils are compelled to have resort to special measures not always in conformity with the final goal, which is not clear even to themselves, in order to exist at all, or if the councils fail to take proper account of the objective situation and fall back into a policy which must bring about their own end: that is regrettable, and will compel us also to flexibility and tactical manoeuvers which can not yet be foreseen. But for the very reason that these dangers have to be reckoned with, one is obliged, prior to their occurence, and as long as possible. to stand all the more consistently for the maximal program and to fight for it. There are enough backward forces, and there is no need to help them to victory; the more concessions are made to them, the more backward they become. To use an expression of Liebknechts's, one must "strive for the impossible in order to make the possible possible." It is only when one renounces intrusion into the real struggle, because history goes other ways than one desires, that one has forfeited the name of revolutionist. What the dutch group has had to say on these questions is no doubt insufficient: how the class is capable of asserting itself, how it can fashion in councils the instrument of suppression which assures the council dictatorship, etc. (We too must refrain from going farther into these questions at this place, but shall deal with them in special articles.) Of one thing, however, we are assured; namely, that the arguments advanced by H.'7. are only stop-gap affairs which bring the solution of the problem not a single step forward. His own answer to the question which he proposes is, as a matter of fact, merely a rechristening of old things which he had already regarded as out of the way. His proposals are nothing but new names for the old party conceptions, and the considerations by which they are supported must then likewise fall back upon the old arguments of the previous labor movement. Once more a clear communist programm is objected to on

the ground that, to be sure, it is fine and lovely in theory, but that practice compels to watering it. Once more the existence of the middle strata, the backwardness of the farmers, etc., must be made to bear the blame for one's own inconsistency, tho in reality it is precisely because of the backwardness and enmity of these strata that the full measure of revolutionary consistency and unambiguity must be maintained. These groups can not be hoodwinked by means of a shrewd policy; their activity can only be prevented and, if necessary, combatted by force. The more the amount of resistance, the more unambiguously must the revolutionary program be represented. The first concession compels to a series of concessions; in the end there will be nothing left of the original design. When, as will undoubtedly be the case, concessions are forced upon the revolutionary movement, that is bad enogh; but to make of these possibly necessary concessions a matter of principle and set them down in a program is equivalent to drawing back from the attempt at radical solutions and is a relapse into the old leadership policy which claims to be able thru "shrewdness" to fashion history after its own desires.

H.W.'s political councils by the side of the economic ones (why separate, anyhow, what practically is quite inseparable ?) are a restoration of the previous party policy which asserted that the party dictatorship realizes that of the masses and is identical with the dictatorship of the class. On this point we reject H. W. absolutely. His warning to the effect that if we reject his position we thereby "leave the field to the other organizations which for the moment are still capable of action" does not move us, since we have no desire to compete with these organizations for following among and control over the masses. We do not wish to persuade the masses to follow us, but to promote their independent movement. We don't say: " Follow us and not the others". We say: "Follow no one, but only your own interests and necessities." These necessities are also ours, so that the framework of the council movement suffices us for our own activity. Until the councils arise, we are of course compelled to form in separate groups, but this defect can not be converted into a quality. We must disappear as a special organization as soon as the masses shape for themselves their organization in the councils. Our place is in the councils, not by the side of them.

No doubt the disquisition of the dutch comrades regarding the work groups and their relation to the mass movements have to be supplemented. The present formulation of theirs on this point often has a painfully

idealistic flavor. But this defect can be remedied, and in no case can one make concessions here to H.W.'s conception.

III

In addition to the questions discussed above, the Brussels theses (C.C.Vol.I;No.11) brought still others up for consideration: the questions of centralism and of state-capitalist tendencies. The question of centralism had already been touched upon by H.W. in his critical remarks, and the article on the new labor movement is as a matter of fact weakened owing to inadequate treatment of this problem. The practical demands of the Brussels theses for more thorough organization of the work groups and illegal formations to the end of safeguarding them and making them more effectual, for the establishment of international connections and better coordination, for the working out of programmatic directives with a view to clarification and orientation in the interest of a more unified and rational procedure-such demands are likewise represented by us in the fullest measure. The criticism directed at them by the dutch group (C.C.,Vol.II;No.1), and which takes the form of an objection to the centralization necessarily involved in this coordination, comes to us as a complete surprise. All that we have been able to gather from the Brussels theses on this point are the simplest practical and obvious steps for the solution of the tasks with which we are faced. The sceptical "Aha! a new Fifth or Sixth International" on the part of the dutch group strikes us as uncalled for and having reference to other matters not referred to, for the Brussels theses themselves do not justify such an objection. The independence of the work groups is not abolished by bringing them organizationally together; rather, without such organization any work group is sooner or later doomed to death. Independence and centarlization are opposites, but nevertheless unavoidable ones, and the marxist doctrine of the unity of opposites should alone suffice to indicate the uselessness of the "for or against" argument. Practically, the dutch group also can not help doing what the Brussels theses propose, unless it should quite renounce any truly revolutionary work at all. Its fear that the following of the Brussels proposals would lead to a dictatorship of the central apparatus over the groups, thus restricting their independence, is the fear of life itself. One can not reject things merely because they involve dangers; one must work in the conditions such as they are and try to carry thru in them and in spite of them.

With the advancing monopolization of world capitalism,

the permanent crisis and the period of world wars, the national peculiarities in relation to the proletarian class struggle in the different countries vanish. The internationalizing of capital and the world-wide over-accumulation create in all capitalist countries the same objectively revolutionary conditions. In the various capitalist countries the tasks and goals of the workers are not essentially distinguishable. In the United States one has, as a matter of fact, to take the same stand as in England or Germany: the overthrow of Capitalism and the establishment of Communism. Even in the U.S.A., already the possibility of any extensive reformist activity is no longer present. The most far-going demand has here also become the most real one. Thus is given the material basis of a unified class-struggle program for all developed capitalist countries. This program, limited like any other, can contain only the more general directives of principle. The only influence which it can exercise upon the various groups is by giving them the assurance that forces everywhere are working in our direction. Practically, it can not do other than assist each individual group in its development. Under the present conditions, it is simply out of the question for a new International to develop as a copy of the previous ones. The two surpassed Internationals were, in all their aspects, bound up with the presence of democracy in several countries and thus with a relative stability of capitalist economy. Under the present economic conditions, even formal democracy is an impossibility, so that such structures as the previous Internationals also become impossible. It is for this reason that Trotsky's attempts to resolve a new International into existence strikes one as so silly. Nor are we either in a position to form an International which could exercise upon the groups the influence feared by the dutch comrades. The question of the council international is not at all acute; the matter at issue is the making use of the possible, however limited, international coperation of our groups. An International does not depend on the resolution to form it, nor is it prevented by an objection. The council-international can, in our opinion, only be the result of a new world-revolutionary wave, and as things stand today there is no probability of such a wave until after the on-coming new world war has run its course. Or else the international crisis would have to deepen so fast as to paralyze in almost inconceivable measure the capacity for action on the part of Capital; but such an eventuality is less likely than an early war.

We share with the authors of the Brussels theses the desire for better international cooperation to the full extent possible, and the organizational and technical

matters involved seem to us so obvious that we think they can be left to the correspondence of the different groups .What holds for better cooperation on the international scale ,holds with still more force for the work groups in the different countries. If by reason of objective impossibilities the old labor movement can not arise anew, so also the dangers with which it is associated can not turn up in the new labor movement. No doubt the new labor movement will have its own dangers and unpleasantnesses, but they will not be those of the past one. Such an absolute statement of the demand for independence of the groups as has been presented by the dutch comrades is not only unmarxist, but practically also impossible. In reality, they too can not help binding together the national and international work groups and thus giving rise to certain central functions. And practically, even if there had been such a desire on the part of the Brussels conference, it would still have been incapable of transferring to the new labor movement the centralism of the previous one. The thing that is needed is to make centralization possible, without thereby preventing the independent development of the groups; and this is not only needed, but anything else in this line is out of the question. Any central apparatus as well as the individual group is prevented in very large measure, by reason of the present situations, from forming permanent instruments of power and repeating the nauseous activity of the previous labor movement.

IV

In its reply to the Brussels theses, the dutch group speaks of two different points of departure by which the conceptions in question are differentiated. It holds that the Brussels theses are based exclusively on the actual problems of the german illegal movement, while its own conception is based on the more far-reaching , general attitude to the problems of communism as they have received expression in the previous publications of the dutch group. In the view of this group, the Brussels theses merely reflect the momentary german practice, which has been willfully elevated to a general theory.

Well, one can have a theory for the daily practical struggle, and one can have a theory which takes into consideration longer spaces of time and broader problems. One can also have a theory which embraces both these points of view. The union of the narrower theory of the Brussels theses with the broader one of the dutch group would do away with the dispute as to which of the two should be given greater importance. The one does not

contradict the other, but is part of the other . Apparently, however, the disquisitions contained in the Brussels theses are not rated by the dutch group as theory at all, but as practical work presented which speaks for itself and nothing else. And then an attempt is made to demonstrate that without theory no proper practice is possible, as if this were all that was needed to dispose of the Brussels theses. Practice appears to the dutch group not as the necessary counterpart of theory, but as a second-rate factor completely dependent on theory. But, anyhow, this has nothing further to do with marxian dialectic, whose doctrine of the unity of opposites shows up the problem of the priority of theory or practice as idle chatter. Theory and practice, consciousness and necessity, are inseparable. Things can be changed with false consciousness as well or as badly as with correct consciousness (always within the limits of the social necessities), but one must cease to be human in order to practice without consciousness, without theory. The degree in which theory conforms with the practical needs of the class determines its value for the class, and under certain circumstances a self-limiting theory may have more practical value than one which tries to embrace in itself more than the direct necessities. And the choice between these theories is not a voluntary, but a compulsory one. Any theory has to proceed from the actual environment, and the greater the extent to which the theory can be reduced to the direct necessities, the greater its direct effect. This direct effect conditions more than the quality of the theory; it conditions also the life of those who do the theorizing. The circumstance that the theses of the Brussels conference sprang from the straight-jacket outlook of german fascism does not diminisb their value. The reproach of the dutch group is based on the still persisting social-democratic conception of the development of human consciousness. Just as the Social Democracy rested its hopes for socialism on the development of the social-democratic ideology, so the dutch comrades hold the communist revolution and communism as possible only when a preponderant mass of the workers have more or less clearly "comprehended" their tasks and possibilities. Here also, consciousness, conceived as ideology, makes history; man first thinks, then he comprehends and then he acts. But such a conception is in contradiction to the actual historical process, and the senselessness of the thing is shown day after day in the fact that the masses don't comprehend and nevertheless in the last instance act correctly. The revolution is not brought about consciously, if we have reference to a consciousness such as it is today generally understood. The great number of errors in relation to the connection between history and class-consciousness result from transferring the laws of the

growth of consciousness in the individual onto the class problems. (We shall soon deal with this question thoroughly.)Class consciousness, however, is something different and is subject to other laws than is the consciousness of the individual. With the neglect of this difference, the dutch group has been deprived of the very possibility of coming nearer to the solution of the problem. The mass of workers--regardless of the extent to which its class-consciousness (as ideology) is developed -- comes into situations which compel it to action. Once it have acted, the new situation arising thereby brings forth ist own consequences. Whether they will or not, the workers are compelled to ever more radical steps, and each of these steps compels to the further pursuit of a goal which conceptually is not at all or but faintly recognized. The struggle for mere existence compels the workers to revolutionary actions, these actions compel to the proletarian dictatorship, the dictatorship to the construction of communism.Each separate stage of the struggle forces out of itself the next one, or the very first stage ends in defeat, which may involve the death of the strugglers. Even tho capitalist economy is ideologically conditioned by commodity fetishism, and production and distribution governed by a social relation, still a progressive unfolding of capitalism was nevertheless and precisely for that reason possible.The same social relation in which the revolution has to be accomplished precludes a conscious procedure on the part of the working masses, without for that reason precluding the revolution itself. If capitalism lives and develops "blindly", so also the revolution against capitalism can only come about in the same way. Any other conception not only violates historical materialism; it is in contradiction to all historical facts. To reckon upon a point of time at which the masses know in advance exactly what they have to do in an insurrection is nonsense. It is only with the success of their compulsory action that the possibility is formed for intellectually comprehending the new situation. The compulsion to action must bestronger than the influence of the capitalist ideology in order to make the latter ineffectual. There is by no means any contradiction involved in saying that the workers begin the revolution contrary to their own conviction. And it is only the course and result of the revolution by which the convictions are changed and the consciousmess adapted to the new reality.(Attempts have been made to solve this problem of consciousness by means of sorelian mysticism and the leninist leadership principle. It is hardly necessary to say that we have nothing to do with these attempts.)

The dutch group is no doubt right in characterizing as a remnant of social-democratic thinking the excessive importance attributed by the Brussels theses to the

state-capitalist tendencies of the present time, even tho an equal amount of social-democratic attitudes has been taken over by the dutch group itself in its own disquisitions with reference to the problem of the development of consciousness. To us also, the Brussels theses have overrated and falsely interpreted the "planned-economy tendencies" under capitalism. All the factors brought out by these theses <u>are tendencies</u> actually created thru monopolization and concentration but which work in a direction exactly opposite to that assumed in the theses. Even a state capitalism after the russian model calls for the revolutionary overturn, the abolition of the present possessing class. The matter that ought to be investigated is whether the russian example can be repeated in other countries or on a world scale; in other words, whether the coming revolutions might remain stuck in a state capitalism after the russian model. We do not regard this as possible, tho the grounds for our rejection of the idea shall not be given at this place. However, on the basis of the existing capitalism, it is precisely the "state-capitalist" tendencies and the attempts at "planned economy" which demonstrate with all clarity the impossibility of planned economy on the national as well as the international plane. It is only thru a revolutionary overturn and the setting aside of the <u>present</u> private-property relations that a state capitalism could merit consideration. The belief that the present-day capitalism could be converted into state capitalism is opposed to Marxism and to the real turn of events. The very factors brought out by the Brussels theses are an expression of the sharpening of the capitalist contradictions. In earlier numbers of the C.C. we have endeavored to prove that the present-day capitalism and planned economy exclude each other. We do not deny the existence of the capitalist tendencies pointed out by the Brussels conference, but we repeat that these tendencies are working in a direction exactly the opposite of th t toward which their sponsors claim to be striving. Capitalist planning is the magnification of planlessness. This is the paradox in which reality is figured.

.....

By way of summary, we may say that we approve(with the stated limitations)the article on "The Rise of a New Labor Movement". At the same time, however, we should like, with H.W., to see the principles there represented worked out into concrete, serviceable directives: a task in which we too shall participate. We reject, however, that part of H.W.'s disquisitions which we have denoted as a mere redecoration of the old party ideology with new terms. As regards the desire for the concretizing of the general principles expressed in the first mentioned article we can not, in relation to our own movement do otherwise than get behind the practical demands of the Brussels conference. Yet at the same

time we reject, with the dutch group, the conceptions developed by that conference with regard to the further tendencies of capitalist development. While in this respect, however, we see eye to eye with the dutch group, still we object most strenuously to the idealism expressed by that group with reference to the question of the development of class consciousness. We ourselves want an international welding together of all council-communist groups on the basis of a unified program.

The discussion to date must be continued until sufficient clarification has been attained. In subsequent numbers of the Council Correspondence , we shall publish our own proposals, and the questions here broached will be taken up in detail.

################

Please Notice

The Council Correspondence will accept for publication articles containing material, which should be brought to the attention of workers, by writers who are not affiliated with the Council Communist Movement. These articles are signed to denote that we do not necessarily endorse the view of the writer entirely. All material presented without signature is to be considered as in agreement with the viewpoint of the Groups of Council Communists of America.We will appreciate suggestions or criticism on any material printed in the Council Correspondence

****

P A M P H L E T S

World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution ?	10¢
The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism	10¢
Leninism or Marxism, by Rosa Luxemburg	10¢
Bolshevism or Communism	5¢
What Next for the American Workers	10¢
THE INEVITABILITY OF COMMUNISM A critique of Sidney Hook's Interpretation of Marx	25¢

Order from:
Council Correspondence-1604 N.California Ave.
Chicago, Ill.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Development of Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy

The Period of the Revolution

The Turn Towards National Self-Assertion

The Betrayal of the Chinese Workers Revolution

Entry into the League of Nations

The Liquidation of the Comintern

Current Trends in Czechoslovakia

Vol. II Nos. 3&4

MARCH 1936

$1.00 YEARLY 10c A COPY

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

∴ Published at 1604 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois ∴

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOVIET RUSSIA'S FOREIGN POLICY.

Recent developments in the policy of a number of Communist Parties have been labeled the August 4th of the Third International. Although this label has certain justification, it does not take into consideration the actual historical background of these developments. When the phraseology of the Comintern is disregarded and only the essence of its activity is considered, it becomes evident that the present action of the Comintern is a logical step in a process that was initiated in the first stages of the Russian Revolution by Lenin himself.

It is a well-known fact that the Comintern is completely dependent upon Russian Foreign Policy and in turn the latter is determined by the innerdevelopment of Russia as well as the position Russia takes among the capitalist powers. An outline of the development of Russian foreign policy will clearly illustrate this relationship,

THE PERIOD OF THE REVOLUTION

The Bolsheviks met the World War with a program for revolution in Russia which contained all the fundamental laws of insurrection and which--due to the necessity for the struggle against imperialist war--was internationalized. This program was not based on proletarian internationalism--as it was for example expounded by the German

"Left" around Rosa Luxemburg--but instead it was based on the social and political conditions of Russia and the position the Russian revolution would be required to take towards the imperialist policies of the European powers and their colonial suppression of the Asiatic peasant countries. Upon these basic conceptions Lenin built his theories which were to guide the bolsheviks and the international proletariat in their struggle against war and for revolution. The world war, he wrote, is an imperialist war which must be terminated by the anti-imperialist revolution of the working class. As this is an international task, it can be solved only by the revolutionary socialists in their own countries. For we Russians the situation is different. We must be content to accept the lesser evil, namely the overthrow of the czarist regime through the combined forces of the workers and peasants. Such a revolution, he continued, would merely be a radical bourgeois revolution but it might mean the beginning of the world revolution if other countries should follow our example. For example, the proletarian masses might rise against their capitalist exploiters in favor of a socialist revolution and the peasant and colonial countries in Asia, Africa, etc., might rise against their imperialist oppressors in favor of a national bourgeois revolution. Such developments might serve to initiate a general reorganization of the present ruling powers.

In the highly developed capitalist countries of Europe, the proletariat--a class--was thus looked upon as the advance guard of the world revolution while in agricultural and colonial countries the struggle was to be waged by "suppressed Nations". Lenin steadfastly believed that an amalgamation of these forces--regardless of the prevailing antagonistic contradictions--would serve the interests of the proletariat and the communist world revolution. As a result of these conceptions the bolsheviks deemed it proper to attack the Kerenski regime in 1917 under the following slogans: No separate peace with Germany; fraternization of the soldiers on all war fronts; ending of the war by international revolutionary action of the working class; disregard of all former and new annexations; self-determination of all national minorities up to and including national independence.

Having attained power, the bolsheviki immediately began to carry out this program. In a declaration of November 8, 1917, they proposed to all warring nations a "just and democratic peace". At the same time they appealed to the class-conscious workers of the three most developed nations, England, France and Germany, to give the Bolsheviks immediate support in their struggle. This was to serve a twofold purpose: first, a compromise with the capitalist powers in order to bring about peace,

and second, the utilization of the rest period thus won to arouse the proletariat against the master class speculating that the necessary world revolution would soon follow. Concrete reality soon proved, however, that their plans were ill-conceived and unworkable.

The First Defeat of the Bolshevik's Foreign Policy

The hope of the bolsheviki of a general soldiers' strike within the enemy armies was not realized. The Bolsheviks themselves were unable to continue the war. The old czarist army was smashed and demoralized; a new army could not be stamped out of the ground. Furthermore, their appeals to the European proletariat to rise against their governments met with no response. Consequently they began to question the hope of a speedy world revolution. Only one point in their program proved to be effective: the right of national self-determination led to the separation of the Russian border states, a move which proved to be very disastrous for the young Soviet Republic. These newly founded states suppressed at first the revolutionary movement within their own boundaries, and later on permitted the Entente and white guards to use their territory as a military base against the Soviet Union. These fateful developments forced the bolsheviks to enter into separate peace negotiations with Germany. At the conference of the two governments at Brest-Litovsk, the German generals demanded more than the bolsheviks were willing to concede, and Trotsky attempted to save his face with the counter-move:"Neither war nor peace". But when the German armies began to march again, the Russians were compelled to accept the German peace dictate under much worsened conditions.

Shortly before the conference at Brest-Litovsk, the executive organ of the soviets had invited the Entente to participate in joint peace negotiations, but in this note they included also the following passage: "Should the allied governments refuse again to participate at the peace conference, the revolutionary working class will face the task of wresting power from those who in blind stubbornness do not want or wish to give the people the long desired peace".

The Entente considered such a language an open challenge and an indirect declaration of war. All relations were severed and the Entente began at once the armed intervention which proved so disastrous for Russian internal development.

The bolsheviks, however, did not as yet abandon entirely the hope of world revolution. They frantically believed that the German workers would rally to their assistance as soon as the anticipated collapse of the German armies

would become an established fact. In the meantime, they considered it necessary to compromise with whatever States were willing to bargain with them and increase, at the same time, their propaganda among the European workers. The development of events after the collapse of the German war machine clearly convinced the bolshevik leadership, however, that the European proletariat was not ripe for the revolution and that for the time being, the hope for a speedy world revolution had to be given up.

The Period of Civil War

The executive of the Soviets announced on November 28, 1917: "The leaders of the successful revolution do not need any approval of any of the representatives of the Capitalist diplomacy". Instead, the Russians cancelled all Czaristic Treaties dealing with the division of Persian and Turkish Territories and appealed to the masses of the working mussulmen to free themselves of their imperialistic exploiters. Their aim was to combat imperialism from both sides, to meet the very aggressive imperialist invasion against the Bolshevists. The numerous counter-revolutionary manifestations were supported by the Entente powers with arms, money and special troops to the white Russian Generals. These powers were not able to wage a direct war against the Soviet Union due to the very critical situation within their own countries. But nevertheless they succeeded in occupying the border territories and gaining control of the Murman Railroad;they waged a direct war with the Czechoslovakian Army against the Soviets, cut off Central Russia from the Southern Russian corn supply, robbed a good deal of the Russian Treasury, destroyed Soviet councils and had many Russian workers shot to death,

The Bolshevists fought the counter revolution with terroristic force and utilized all available resources in this obstinate fight. The period of war communism was introduced to further Bolshevik interests in the Civil War on the economic front. The revolutionary situation in many European countries was expected by Soviet Russia to introduce a Western European revolution which they believed was due. The Bolshevists cancelled all war debts of the czaristic and Kerenski Governments,but were forced to make a concession in October 1918,declaring in a note to Wilson: "that they agreed for the present to participate in negotiations with such governments that do not yet represent the will of their subjects". They asked Wilson whether the U.S.A. and her allies would stop intervention "providing the Russian people would agree to make payment just as a kidnaped person would pay ransom to free himself". In January 1919 the Bolshevists again negotiated with the government of the

United States: "We share your desire to re-establish normal relations between America and Russia, to abolish everything that may hinder these normal conditions". Beginning February 1919, the allies suggested that a conference be held at the Prince Islands with the aim of ending all intervention through direct negotiations with Russia, and the Soviet Government then declared in regard to the war debt problem: "to be ready to meet in this respect the demands of the Ententepowers", and they suggested to guarantee their interest obligations by the supply of certain raw materials as equivalent. For the first time they offered economic concessions, and finally declared that they did not intend to exclude negotiations regarding the eventual annexation of Russian territory by the Entente powers".

All these offers could not prevent the continuance of the civil war, as the Entente Powers were set on the destruction of the Bolshevists. They were in an extremely threatening situation when the first Congress of the 3rd International was called to be held at Moscow during March 1919. The foreign member parties represented there were very small and had to go through a number of decisive defeats. The chances for a direct revolutionary action by the new organization was very slight.But the situation was favorable and the first Congress was directed by the revolutionary slogans of Lenin: joint agrarian and proletarian revolution; change war into civil war, worker's councils, dictatorship: "the old capitalist order ceased to exist; it can't exist any longer".

A Bolshevistic socialization program was outlined and the relations between Socialistic Russia and the triumphant imperialistic powers and their vassal states and countries of besieged imperialism were delineated. The newly founded League of Nations was considered to be an instrument of the holy Alliance of Capitalism to overthrow the workers' revolution; the epoch of world revolution was announced. The days preceding the first Comintern Congress were days of defeats in Europe.The March Revolt at Berlin, the Rate-Republic of Munich, the Hungarian Revolution were decisive defeats by the middle European counter-revolution against the revolutionary lefts isolated by the proletarian masses. The Russians as before were in a pressed position. Isolated,they believed the time was not ripe for a revolutionary upsurge in Western Europe. They started the Bolshevist tactics centralized at Moscow, with its methods so well proven on Russian soil. "Appeal to the Masses" was the slogan that made them trail quite unexpectedly along the path of a radically edged opportunism. At the time when by means of the bad bureaucratic methods of Radek and Levi the Communist Party of Germany was directed to parlia-

mentary action and participation in the work of the counter-revolutionary Unions and the ultra-left majority was ousted (fall 1919, Heidelberg Party Conference) they had not yet disposed of their illusions of a timely revolutionary advance. However, as direct experience showed that Lenin's methods, so infallible in Russia, did not work out in Western Europe with its highly developed Capitalism, Russia had to establish herself as a national state in the midst of her capitalist surroundings. Her Comintern policy became, without altering her Bolshevist line, a policy of deferring the West European Revolution. The revolutionary policy was never given up, but it was changed from a problem of hazardous venture to a question of an enterprise with a 100% success guarantee in advance. This meant, if not theoretically, so practically the absolute end of all revolutionary struggle.

The Turn Towards National Self-Assertion

By the end of 1919, the Soviet Government had succeeded in subduing by military force the counter-revolution at home, i.e. to repel the cloaked invasion of the Allies. The victory in the civil war, however, was accompanied by the defeat of the system of war communism. In the first place, the economic supply of the country diminished by 80%. Secondly, the proletariat began to rebel against the terroristic dictatorship of Bolshevism and to demand council-democracy. Furthermore, the peasants violently put forth their economic demands which they emphasized by acts of far-reaching sabotage. (The Kronstadt rebellion was a typical combination of the workers' political and the peasants' economic demands. Trotsky, through Stalin's assistance, made himself the slaughterer of the Kronstadt proletariat, surpassing a Noske in cold-bloodedness and savagery and thereby clearing the path towards fulfillment of the peasants' demands.) The new economic policy (NEP) flung the door wide open to small private capital, primarily of peasant and merchant character. A private economy of small capital, controlled by the state, was to insure the economic rise of the nation.

In foreign politics, the Russians adopted the policy of retreat, after having suffered a considerable military defeat in the war against Poland. In a proclamation to the "toilers" of the Allied countries of January 28,1920, Tchicherin declared that Russia had no intention of expanding her power to any other foreign country or to force the Soviet system upon any people against their will. The appeal for the proletarian revolution assumed a meek and platonic character. Not the world revolution but the necessity to establish her place among the nations of the world, determined Russia's foreign policy.

Just as Lenin--before and during the Russian revolution--

developed a broadly conceived strategy of making use of the various class forces, so he developed now a strategy of making use of the various nations for the purpose of strengthening Russia's foreign-political position. With the renunciation of an immediate revolutionary world policy, was bound up the necessity of diplomatic security for the Soviet state. Russia started with the first Western securities. In the course of the year 1920, she gained final recognition by Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Finland. These border states felt the immediate pressure of the Soviet state; they also had the urgent need for a counter balance in order to escape domination by the Western powers, at least to a certain degree.

This policy of the small nations, which--with the assistance of the Allies--two years earlier had put an end to the communistic revolution, caused Lenin to proclaim in the year 1920 the direct alliance with "the bourgeoisie of the small states". He declared that the Bolsheviks had been successful in winning for themselves not only the workers of all countries, but also the bourgeoisie of the small states, because imperialism was not only suppressing the workers of all countries but also the bourgeoisie of the small states. For this reason, the Bolsheviks "had won for themselves the wavering bourgeoisie of progressive countries.

In this period of growing alliances between the Soviet Union and the Bourgeoisie of certain capitalistic countries, the second congress of the Comintern convened. It laid the foundation for a revolutionary bluff-phraseology, which left the Comintern leadership free of all obligations. The manifesto of the congress announced the downfall of Europe and the world, and the uprising of the proletariat: "Civil war throughout the world is the order of the day". - For the rest, the congress directed its attention largely to the colonial East and proclaimed "a policy of concluding a close alliance between Soviet Russia and all movements for national and colonial liberation". Particularly did the congress recommend the organization of the peasant movement in the colonies with the aim of creating peasants' soviets.

This stand for an East-Asiatic revolution still implied a strong will for a peasant revolutionary attack upon imperialism. The decisions with regard to the Countries of Western Europe, however, were mainly of a different character. There the Russians were interested in founding for themselves a broad parliamentarian - trade union mass movement. "Penetrate the Masses" demanded their slogans, giving directions for the displacement of the old leadership and for creating bolshevist nuclei in the various reformistic labor organizations. The twenty-one conditions concerning the joining of the Comintern by new

parties brought forth no fundamental struggle on the question of tactics. Parliamentarism, trade-unionism and the ultimate demands for a proletarian dictatorship brought Centrists and Bolsheviks together. These twenty-one conditions, however, served the Russian leadership with regard to the mass parties of centrism that were to join the Comintern. The old leadership was to be disposed of, the centrist - democratic traditions within the organizations were to be destroyed. The lack of clear understanding among the followers of these parties rather benefitted the Moscow leadership, which intended to direct these organizations in the momentary interest of its complicated foreign policies, and, at the same time, aimed to make them the reserves for a future revolution. These two tasks necessarily contradicted themselves, which explains the duplicity of the Comintern policies and led to the disregard of the interests of the Western Europe proletariat. The core of all decisions of the second congress, however, is to be found in the following statement of the manifesto of the Communist International: "The Communist International has made Soviet Russia's cause its own."

ENTERING INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY

Moscow's ideas of participating in International Diplomacy, born in 1920, blossomed out during 1921.The gradual consolidation of the NEP brought with it the first. easening in the plight of this horribly distracted country. After the European situation, the Asiatic problem was of first importance. Soviet Russia began the diplomatic counter-attack against England's politics in Asia. In February and March 1921, the U.S.S.R. concluded pacts of neutrality and non-aggression with Persia,Afghanistan and Turkey. While Russia forsook old Czarist claims and agreements, it gained the assurance of mutual military support. Persia announced its readiness to admit Russian troops on Persian soil in case of a foreign (British) invasion. Afghanistan gladly accepted the promise of Russian money and material, and Turkey embraced the assurance of the "Nations of the near East of her freedom and independence and her self-determination in matters concerning her own form of state". Simultaneously,Soviet Russia procured recognition from Poland which was then trying to liberate herself from French domination, and finally, in November 1921, outer Mongolia was taken under Russian protection. Besides all these achievements, including annexing and Bolshevising Georgia, the Soviet Union realized many political victories all along the Asiatic frontier, which in turn improved her position in the West as well.

The NEP Program, of course, included the commencement

of trade relations with capitalist states, as well as the invitation to foreign capital to invest in private concessions in the U.S.S.R. Europe, in turn, decidedly weakened by the World War, was in no position to do other than to finally accept the existence of Soviet Russia, and the latter's repeated assurances that economic relations would lead to mutual economic benefits.

In 1921 Russia had already concluded economic treaties with Great Britain, Germany, Norway, Austria and Italy, with Czechoslovakia following in June 1922. All these treaties, of course, brought de facto recognition of the U.S.S.R.; the German-Russian Agreement included even extra-Territoriality Rights for Russian trade representatives.

Russia, in turn, obligated herself to the strict enforcement of the so-called "Propaganda Clause", and in 1919 already announced her willingness to include in the general treaty with the Entente Powers this clause, i.e. "to abstain from interfering in their (Entente's) home affairs". In Germany, after the signing of the Russo-German Treaty of May 5, 1921, Russian representatives had to bind themselves to repress all propaganda against the German state or its institutions. A step further in that direction is illustrated by the pact with Czechoslovakia. Here the governments of the respective countries pledged "each to refrain from any propaganda against the government of the co-signer or against any of its institutions, and not to take part in any possible economic disturbances which might arise in either country."

Great Britain, finally in 1923, received from the U.S.S.R the following declaration: Russia shall not support or finance any agents, organizations or institutions whose aim it is to create unrest in Great Britain, or any other part of her empire no matter how loosely connected, and to impress upon her officers to completely and permanently live up to this contract. (Memorandum of the Soviet Government of June 4, 1923.) It is well known that this very clause led to the severance of British-Russian relation in 1924 when England, basing her argument upon the fabricated letter of Zinoviev, tried to arrange a new contract. Directed against the Comintern, the new Pact, which was not accepted until 1929, would also include persons and organizations under direct or indirect control of U.S.S.R. and organizations which accepted money from those. The Soviet Union, of course, refuses with formal right to have any influence upon the Comintern, and this is sanctioned by all so-called experts of International Law.

Under this shadow, the Third World Congress of the

Comintern convened. Although at that time Russia had only started an international diplomatic apparatus, it nevertheless supplanted the comintern foreign office very soon. As world capitalism presently recognized the Soviet Union, Russia in turn gave up her faith in World Revolution and observed the rehabilitation of world capitalism. The perspectives of the Third Congress were greatly reduced when Zinoviev announced:"The Third International has her tactical principles adjusted to a slow development."

The relative consolidation of power of the Bourgeoisie brought about a renunciation of revolutionary activities of the Third International. By formally condemming Levy (Germany) the Comintern refused to support the Maroh revolutionary activities in Germany and stated that the fight of the workers in the future could only be defensive, while the Congress theoretically decided against centralistic leadership in Italy, practically there were not many changes. In Germany, the C.P. amalgamated with the U.S.P. (Independent Socialist) while they refused to remain with the "Ultra Left" K.A.P. (Communist Workers Party). All these selected tactics, of course, brought the European C.P. toward the S.P. The possibilities of "United Front from above" and "the perspectives toward parliamentarian Labor-Governments" were marked out,and it was under the influence of those tactics that Brandler before a German Court announced: "It is the goal of our party to establish the dictatorship of the Proletariat under the Weimer (German) Constitution".

Russia Becomes A Factor of International World Politics

"Without Russia there will be no restoration of world economy", Radek declared in 1920. This statement not only served the interest of Russian domestic economy, but also those of world capitalism, and enabled Russia to begin negotiations with Western powers. Having been successful in signing satisfactory commercial treaties with several smaller states, she began the fight for participation at the important international conferences. In 1921 she protested vehemently for not having received an invitation to the Washington conference which dealt with colonial policies (sphere of influence) in the Pacific Ocean, China, etc. Her protests were in vain;but in March 1922 she obtained admission to the conference at Geneva which dealt with the economic and financial restoration of Europe. Tchicherin, the Russian foreign secretary, declared in behalf of the Russian delegation: "Soviet Russia is of the opinion that the present time which makes possible the parallel existence of the old capitalist and the gradually developing new social order, necessitates close co-operation between the two social systems, in the interest of a general economic restoration". He continued to point out the reasons for Russia's

wish to obtain friendly relationship and commercial treaties with other powers. And because "the economic restoration of Russia--the largest country in Europe, with the greatest supply of natural resources--is the prerequisite for a restoration in all other countries" therefore Russia is willing to open its boundaries for international transit, to lease millions of hectares of soil for cultivation, and to grant extensive concessions in coal, forest and ore development. The Russian memorandum assured foreign entrepreneurs more than adequate guarantees and promised even to compensate foreign state subjects for losses suffered during the world war. By offering such concessions, Russia hoped to obtain capitalistic support for its own economic restoration. "The financial support from other countries is of utmost importance for the economic restoration of Russia" Tchicherin told Lloyd George, the leader of the British delegation,on April 20, 1922. The eight capitalistic delegations at this conference, however, demanded not only a number of political guarantees but also repayment of the czarist war debts which the Russians could not grant. Consequently, they arrived at no agreement. But in their final memorandum the Russian delegation declared again: "In order to bring about a mutual understanding, Russia is still inclined to grant far reaching concessions providing the other powers do likewise".

For Russia the conference at Geneva was not a success as far as financial support was concerned, but due to the antagonistic constellation of the European powers, it opened the road towards closer connection with Germany and soon afterwards the two governments signed the treaty of Rapallo. Germany recognized Russia de jure, and thereby won an ally in her fight against the Treaty of Versailles. Both governments renounced all claims regarding payment of war debts. "The Rapallo treaty opens the door to Russia for German capital", Preobrashenski wrote in a pamphlet. The German capital, however, was not utilized in the interest of Russian restoration but instead was used for building German aeroplanes and poison gas factories. It is even suspected that there existed a secret clause in the treaty which called for close military co-operation in case of a German-Polish war similar to the one which called for combined military operation against France should Germany choose to liberate herself from the Treaty of Versailles.

The elimination of Germany as a possible aggressor thru the Treaty of Rapallo induced Russia to seek similar treaties with her border states. She offered to reduce her standing army to 200,000 but when the border states refused to discuss disarmament, Russia, in turn,refused to participate at a conference which was to discuss non-aggression pacts. Thru this maneuver, Russia indirectly

at the party congress in Essen (1925), the CPG declared that until 1923 Germany was not an imperialist but a nationally suppressed country and the at that time expected war with France would not have been an imperialist war but instead a national war waged for the purpose of liberating a suppressed people. In such a case, it would have been the duty of the CPG to support it unhesitatingly. It seems hardly conceivable that the ECCI in 1923 considered it possible to carry its "socialism" on the bayonets of the red army to Germany, and after having succeeded in helping her to throw off the Treaty of Versailles undertake the difficult task of crushing the united German bourgeoisie. It is worthy to note that this ideology resembles to a hair the one expounded by the National communist, Wolfheim-Lauffenberg, in 1919. But even Lenin himself renounced whatever basic revolutionary ideas were left in the Comintern when he declared that socialism in the highly developed countries of Europe would not grow out of the capitalistic economic contradictions but rather thru imperialist exploitation of one state by another. (Coll. Works, Vol.XVIII, p. 136; Russ. ed.)

Having thus formulated the new slogans, the Comintern began to identify the German war for national liberation with the German workers revolution. Still greater stress was laid upon the necessity for united front action and parliamentary participation in coalition governments. This change in policy met with success in Thuringia and Saxonia (1923) where CP and SP members formed coalition governments. This sacrifice to their revolutionary principles was made, explained the communist leaders, in order to assure success for the real German revolution which was scheduled to break out in the fall of 1923. At the last minute, however, after all plans had been carefully worked out, the orders for the uprising were withdrawn "due to the treachery of the SPG and the inability of certain communist leaders".The fact however, is that the Comintern had suddenly discovered that an armed insurrection of the German proletariat would not lie in the interest of Russia's foreign policy and for that reason the German proletariat had to be sacrificed. With this step the Comintern, which for years had subordinated the world revolution to inner Russian development, completely abandoned the last straws of revolutionary class-consciousness. Russia realized that neither a war against France nor a revolution in Germany would be of any benefit to her. She accepted as the lesser evil the "status quo", and thereby laid the foundation for the now "famous" slogan of "socialism in one country".

The Pacification of Russia's Western Policy

Although a quick economic recovery was achieved in the NEP period, the final results, nevertheless, were considerably below the Bolshevist expectations. The difficulties of construction increased; the first planned experiments were experiments outside of the economic system, and the foreign concessions continued to be of very moderate size. Therefore, the energies of the Bolsheviks were concentrated on the interior situation,and there the difficulties demanded their whole attention. Their foreign policies towards Western capitalism were of a purely diplomatic-defensive function: development of economic relations, protection against all disturbances and interferences, no matter whether of war-like or revolutionary character.

Russia's relations to Germany lost their former intimacy, although further cooperation was assured on a remote scale under the leadership of German "Reichswehr" circles. A German-Russian commercial treaty was signed in 1925 which for a long time occupied the first place in the Russian business. In 1926 there even resulted a non-aggression pact which evidently represented the continuation of the German-Russian cooperation in the Polish question.

Apart from this, further relations between Russia and other capitalist powers were developed. Still in 1923 it declared its willingness to participate in a conference for the restriction of sea-armaments.In the course of 1924 it finally succeeded in obtaining the official (.volkerrechtliche) recognition from a number of countries. Great Britain, Italy, Norway, Austria, Greece, Sweden, Denmark, Mexico, Hedschas, Hungaria, France,etc. resumed normal diplomatic relations with Russia in 1924. Beginning of 1925 Japan followed suit. Only the U.S.A., which was sufficiently occupied with its own internal problems, did not follow.

The fifth world congress of the Comintern, which took place in the summer of 1924, responded adequately to the "changed situation", i.e. the changed character of the foreign policies. Thus it took notice of the "beginning of a certain democratic-pacific phase" in the world policies, and it praised the Soviet Union as the only country with a policy of "real peace". As usual, the responsibility for the German defeat was denied by the leadership of the Comintern. For this they held responsible, according to the resolution on the report of the ECCI, the "deceit of the leaders of the SPG and the inability of the leadership of the CPG."The united front tactics were now regarded as only "a revolutionary

method of agitation and mobilization of the masses"; the "right deviation" of Brandler-Thalheimer was recorded, (with the simultaneous election of Brandler as honorary chairman of the congress!); and the short era Ruth Fischer-Maslow was approved of to conceal the defeat of the Comintern. Practically, the strengthened "ultra left" phraseology was combined with purely parliamentary perspectives. Although the Socialist Parties were called the third parties of the bourgeoisie, the possibility of the formation of "workers' governments" in a "number of countries" was viewed visible. Such governments would "objectively" mean progress as they announced the decay of the bourgeoisie. The task of the "real followers of the proletarian revolution" would consist in "transforming the so-called workers' governments into "the dictatorship of the proletariat". However, the parliamentary-cretinist character of the Comintern doubtlessly reached the limit with the consideration of the German defeat. It was declared: "After the severest defeat of the revolutionary movement in Germany, after a subsequent inner crisis and after the most brutal persecutions, the Communist Party of Germany succeeded in quickly reassembling its ranks, created a strong and able leadership and demonstrated, through a brilliant election victory with three and three-quarter million votes, its revolutionary force as being larger and stronger than ever before". Thus the revolutionary movement in Germany in the autumn of 1923 , defeated with the aid of the Comintern, gave the latter cause to celebrate the "revolutionary force" of an "election victory", which, incidentally, lasted only to December of the same year.

Having switched over to this course, the Comintern parties now represented nothing but a thorn in the flesh of the capitalist countries, operated in a half-putschistic and half-parliamentary fashion, and representing a reserve iron which could at a later time eventually again be used on the soviet anvil. In this course the leaders of the Comintern took care that the fire was properly banked. Already in 1925 the "ultra lefts" Fischer-Maslow were disposed of, an action which lead to the splitting off of the Trotskyan "Lenin Group" and which resulted in bringing the kowtowing Thalmann to the foreground. In reality, Russia tried to suppress any revolutionary movement. Although Germany did not represent any field for revolutionary action after the shameful and fightless defeat of 1923, England now became the place of an increasing crisis. Unable to build an effective C.P. in England, the Bolshevists made every possible effort to find a counter-force against the sharp anti-Russian course of the English bourgeoisie. They accepted the ultra-reformistic trade unions as this counter-force and figured on their parliamentary influence. From 1925 to 1927 the glorious Anglo-Russian Committee was active,

the united front between the leadership of the Russian State and English reformism, as a united front against the anti-Russian diplomacy of England as well as against the English proletariat. In 1926 the gigantic English miners' strike took form, the largest workers' fight in English history. The British trade unions, allied with the Russians, suppressed the general strike and prevented extension of the fight to the front of all the English working class. During nine hard months of terrific struggling, neither trade unions nor the Bolshevists came to the aid of the starving English miners who were giving their blood for the proletarian sake. Carefully avoiding any steps of attack, the Bolsheviks continued the activity of the Anglo-Russian Committee, as their diplomatic interests were worth far more to them than the interests of the English and the international proletariat. The Bolsheviks tried to avert any danger of war against their country, but simultaneously they prevented the European revolution which would threaten their shaking social system just as much as a military detonation.

Russia Turns East

Abandoning their hope for a speedy revolution in Europe, the bolsheviki began to direct their "revolutionary activities" towards the East. At the time the Comintern was calling off the German revolution in October 1923, they were busy organizing the first international peasant congress. With this instrument--the Peasant International--they hoped to embrace all colonial and half-colonial peasant countries and unite them--as they had done before with the Communist Parties--under the leadership of Moscow. In spite of the fact that their attempt met with little success due to adverse objective conditions, they never ceased to bend every effort toward achieving that goal. Even as late as 1928, the sixth world congress of the Comintern instructed the ECCI to renew its activity towards the founding of an international peasant soviet. We may recall here that the fifth world congress (Summer 1924) had already ratified the organization of the peasant international and had instructed its sections to work in closer contact with the peasant organizations in order to consolidate everywhere "workers and peasants blocs". These resolutions were made to fit the situation in China and to introduce the new policy under which the Chinese Communist Party was compelled to cooperate with the Chinese nationalist party, the KUO-MIN-TANG.

The theses condoning the new tactics frankly stated that "the Comintern had paid too much attention to the development in Europe" and that it is now of utmost importance to further the development of those mass movements in the

East which struggle to liberate themselves from the imperialist oppression and from which--as Stalin declared--would spring the decisive initiative for the world revolution. But also here the bolsheviki played a double role. While they endeavored to mobilize the peasant masses, at the same time they signed pacts of mutual agreement and understanding with the respective governments. In the pact with Turkey, they renounced all revolutionary activity because Kemal Pasha held the key position to Minor Asia about which a silent but bitter struggle was being waged between Russia and England. That under Kemal Pasha's regency every Communist was imprisoned or even hanged did not bother the Russian bolsheviki. The treaty with Turkey in 1926 followed the treaty with Afghanistan which provided mutual armed support should a third party trespass the borders of either of the two signatories. Russia thereby hoped to prevent England from using Afghanistan as a military base against her. A similar pact was signed in 1927 with Persia. These treaties were important to Russia insofar as they protected her South-Eastern frontier against an English invasion.

Of far greater importance, however, were the treaties she signed with China in 1924. The Chinese governments in Manchukuo and Peiping recognized her de jure. Russia annulled the czarist treaties, renounced all compensation due her for the boxer rebellion, and established China's right, on an equal basis, to the Eastern Railroad. This treaty brought about closer relationship to the Kuomintang which was openly supported by the bolsheviki. An harmonious co-operation between the Chinese Republic and Russia appeared to be a certainty.

The Betrayal of the Chinese Workers Revolution

The bolsheviki were victorious in Russia because they had been able to combine the interests of the workers with those of the peasants, and in their conception, the world revolution was merely a repetition of this procedure on an international scale. Although they had to realize that this policy was instrumental in the defeat of the European proletariat, they nevertheless hoped to employ it successfully in China.

Since 1925, the revolutionary movement of the Chinese proletariat had registered an hitherto unknown upswing, and China became the only country in Asia in which it was possible for the Comintern to build up a strong and active party. In conformity with the leninist-stalinist theory of the national liberation of imperialistically oppressed nations, this party--which had led heroic struggles against an infantile capitalism--was compelled to join the Kuomintang. The bolsheviki instructed the CPCh to organize united front bodies with the Bourgeoisie

and middle class. In 1926, the Kuomintang began in Canton the military offensive against the rebellious Northern provinces. Within two years they were the sole rulers of China. This speedy success had been made possible by the many revolts of the peasants and workers against the Northern generals. Shanghai was conquered in 1927,again with the aid of the workers who had risen against the Peiping troops. After the capture of Shanghai, the victorious Kuomintang general Chiang-Kai-chek demanded disarmament of the proletariat. The CPCh, following the advice of their Russian comrades, surrendered all weapons after which Chiang-Kai-chek ordered the persecution and beheading of thousands of rebellious workers.Moscow betrayed the proletariat of Shanghai because it considered a mutual understanding with the bourgeois elements and their butcher-general of greater importance. The CPCh had to remain within the Kuomintang but shortly later it was dealt another severe blow. Instead of attacking the Northern stronghold Peiping, Chiang-kai-chek's army marched against Wuhan where a communist government had been erected. The leaders of this government--all of them were former influential delegates to the Comintern--saved their necks by joining the invading hostile forces. This development must be considered as the logical consequence of the national policy the Comintern had pursued in China. Moscow tried to white-wash herself by expelling scores of 'unworthy' leaders.

The proletarian uprising of the Canton workers against the regime of Chiang-Kai-chek in December 1927--which was organized by Heinz-Neumann--was not only a hazardous adventure, but a deliberate crime. Thousands of workers lost their lives in what was known beforehand a losing battle, and thousands of others were massacred after the struggle. The Canton Soviet of 1927 can be compared with the Paris Commune of 1871: both struck a deathly blow to the revolutionary working class. The defeats at Shanghai and Canton--instigated and provoked by the Comintern--choked the Chinese revolutionary movement.

Only very slowly and laboring under great difficulties, the CPCh began to rebuild the party but not any more as a workers organization but instead sought to recruit new members from the peasantry. Since 1930 she has been actively engaged in many peasant uprisings and was also instrumental in the formation of the so-called Soviet-China, which comprises a few provinces in the interior. Moscow managed to remain the adviser and guide, and at this front it is really aggressive. But as Russia's activity in Eastern Asia embodies grave consequences to English interests, the latter untiringly endeavors to head off the Russian drive by irritating diplomatic maneuvers in Europe which compel Moscow to act with utmost caution and further compromises to her Western neighbors.

Should China consolidate in one form or another, it is highly probable that Russia would completely abandon her interest in the Chinese revolution--certain recent events point already in that direction--and would confine herself to the "building of socialism" within her own boundaries. She would then--as far as Asia is concerned--follow the road she has pursued in Europe since 1923.

On the Way To the "League of Nations"

When--after a four-year intermission!--the sixth world congress of the Comintern assembled in the year 1928, the liquidation of the chinese workers' revolution had only to be recorded. It had by this time been noted even in Moscow that the Kuomintang had "gone definitively over into the camp of the counter-revolution" and inflicted "severe defeats" on peasants and workers of China. The orientation upon the peasant movement was clearly expressed and entered as the last credit item in Comintern affairs: "The colonial countries are at present the most dangerous sector for the front of world imperialism", declared the Theses on the revolutionary movements in the colonies and semi-colonies. Accordingly, very detailed directions were worked out for bolshevist policy in the larger colonial and semi-colonial areas, and orders were given for the forming there of Comintern parties. It is a matter of note that the theses with reference to colonial policy occupy 45 pages in the official protocol of the congress, while the theses on tactics of the Comintern as a whole require only 31 pages. Moscow activity was therefore unequivocally directed toward the East, and in fact toward the peasant East.

If the Comintern adopted a more aggressive tone on the questions of european policy as well, that was, on the one hand, a natural consequence of the altered political situation in Russia itself; it was also, however, the new deceptive manoeuver for distracting attention from the policy of drawing still closer to the bourgeoisie of Western Europe.

In 1928 the NEP-policy came to its final close. On the question of forced organization and concentration of industry and agriculture, the bolshevist government went over to downright state-capitalism,to the offensive. The first five-year plan was proclaimed, collectivization introduced, the struggle taken up against NEP-speculators, small traders and kulaks. In harmony with this intensified course of action, the sixth congress proclaimed the famous theory of the "third period",which was to lead to war between the imperialist powers and to

war against the Soviet Union as well as to the utmost sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism. The year 1929 was the year of the highest post-war boom of the capitalist countries; nevertheless in this same year the CP of Germany, for example, worked the revolutionary watchwords to death by means of continual calls for strikes or general strikes, calls which met with general ridicule. They drove the unemployed into senseless actions which used up their energies before the subsequent crisis began to require the throwing in of the proletarian forces. The rapprochment with the SP was broken off, this party was declared the representative of "social fascism", the trade unions were "split" by means of the "red union opposition" (RGO) fiasco, work in the factories was given up in favor of the exclusive organization of the unemployed.

At the same time, with the turn in german foreign policy, the sixth congress laid it down that the anti-soviet block of imperialist powers was completed. It needed this false and delusive thesis because the Russians, with the close of the chinese adventure, had renounced all really revolutionary action on the part of the international working class and accordingly, wearing the halo of the five-year plan, shoved into the foreground the decorative slogan of "socialism in one country". World imperialism vs. Soviet Union: that became the formula of the Comintern's perspectives as simplified by the stalinist regime, while at the same time the Soviet Union, for the same reason of furthering the five-year-plan policy, threw itself definitely into the course of economic and politico-pacifistic understanding with the imperialist world powers.

The efforts to get into the imperialistic-diplomatic business of the League-of-Nations countries were begun by the Russians even a number of years before this time. Participation in the first session of the preparatory disarmament commission was only formally declined in the spring of 1926, since the session was held in Switzerland and this country had still refused to give any satisfaction for the murder of Vorovski (1923 in Geneva). At the end of 1927, at the same time that Chiang Kai-shek was shooting down Neumann's insurrection in Canton, the Russians went into the preparatory disarmament conference. They threw havoc into international diplomacy with their proposal for the "complete abolition of all fighting forces on land, on sea and in the air", but soon fell in with the "reasonable" rules of imperialist foreign policy. As early as March 1928, they drew back, in the "securities committee" of the League of Nations, from their thesis of the complete to that of a partial disarmament. Litvinov explained: "Since our proposal for a complete and general disarmament has been met by most

of the delegations with the idea of a partial disarmament, the soviet delegation has decided to look about for a common ground with the other delegations, even tho it be on the restricted field of such a partial disarmament". The stage on which the groupings, coalitions and counter-coalitions for the future imperialist world war were forged and disrupted had been entered upon. The Russians displayed a very high degree of diplomatic skill in the fog of this and the following disarmament conferences, which in themselves were merely designed to conceal the continuous and intensive arming of all the participants, inclusive of the Soviet Union.

In the summer of 1928, the arming powers concluded the Kellogg pact, which was to be a many-sided agreement regarding the prohibition of war as an instrument of foreign policy, met with enthusiastic approval throughout the world, was signed by all the more important States and led practically to this: that, firstly, the States waged wars without a formal declaration to that effect (e.g., Japan in Manchuria), and, secondly, the League of Nations, in the case of any military conflict, declared its incompetence as sponsor of the Kellogg pact. Tschitcherin referred to the Kellogg pact as a part of the war preparation against the Soviet Union, with which expression he probably meant to explain and justify the adherence of Russia.

Peace Diplomacy in the World Crisis of Capitalism

The advent of the world crisis was accompanied by a great increase of economic and political uncertainty in world policy. Accordingly, the Russians intensified their endeavors to assure economic and political understanding with the capitalist Powers and to hold off all outer disturbances from their work of construction at home. The year 1929 saw the conclusion of an eastern Kellogg pact, in which Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Rumania and Russia undertook to recognize the Kellogg Pact independently of its ratification by the 14 States by which it was originally concluded. This eastern protocol was adhered to later by Turkey and Persia.

The economic business with the capitalist States made progress. In 1930 a trade agreement was entered into with England, and the one with Italy (dating from 1924) was considerably expanded. In March 1931 the Russians took part in the international agrarian conference at Rome so as to promote the export of soviet cereals. They likewise participated in the agrarian and export conference at Stresa in the autumn of 1932. The relations with german capitalism became so close that in the spring of 1931 there journeyed to Moscow a number of big german industrialists who conducted negotiations regarding ex-

pansion of Germany's "russian business" and came away with over a half-billion gold marks in orders alone.The soviet orders provided 300 to 400 thousand german workers with "wages and bread", as the CP press of Germany proudly announced, and a part of the bankrupt german capitalism with profits and the possibility of existence, as the same press modestly failed to state.

The economic diplomacy of the Russians was mostly conducted, however, only in the interest of their political diplomacy. And in this latter field they were immeasurably more active. In the spring of 1931 they introduced in the european committee of the League of Nations the draft of a general non-aggression pact,which in autumn they laid before the League itself in the shape of an economic non-aggression pact. These drafts contained, like all the later agreements and proposals of the sort, a definition of the "aggressor". All these definitions were distinguished by a formal exactness which met with general approval. In exchange, the Bolsheviks practically struck from the soviet lexicon all the conceptions regarding the essense of imperialistic war as they had been entered there by Lenin.They broke up imperialist policy into an "aggressive" and a "defensive" one, and thereby went back to the shabby ideology with which parties of the Second International in the year 1914 justified their support of war being waged by their national and imperialistic bourgeoisie.And that was done for quite the same reasons,for the Russians were seeking alliance with imperialistic bourgeoisies, and they had to look in advance for the ideological justification of such a coalition policy with imperialist groups, a policy the practice of which had been delayed by the Social Democracy until the outbreak of the World War.

The Bolsheviks pointed the way throughout the world for the system of regional pacts which distinguishes the distracted foreign policy of imperialism in the world crisis. In the year 1932, they concluded the non-aggression pacts with the countries on the western border of Russia: Finland, Poland, Latvia, Estonia and Rumania (with the exclusion of the bessarabian question). This diplomatic act of securing the russian west boundary was followed by the conclusion of the non-aggression pact with France, which was ratified in February 1933. This diplomatic step released Russia from Germany and paved the way for the great change of front in european policy which was accomplished with Hitler's accession to power. Soviet diplomacy had well calculated the change of imperialist horses in soviet foreign policy.

In the year 1932 there were still in existence,besides, non-aggression pacts with a number of other countries:

with Germany, with Italy, with Turkey, with China, etc. Diplomatic relations with the government of Chiang Kai-chek, which had been broken off in December 1927, were likewise resumed in December 1932. The upheavals in the course of the world crisis led a number of other countries to recognize the Soviet Union definitively:Spain and the United States in 1933, Hungary, Rumania and Czechoslovakia in 1934. The recognition on the part of the three latter came about in the wake of the franco-russian alliance policy, while the U.S.A. became reconciled to the act because this country could no longer dispense with the Soviet Union in the game for pre-eminence in Eastern Asia, the game against Japan.

The sharp turn in german foreign policy--onto the line of Hitler's old plans for colonization in the East--brought about, in conjunction with the intensification of german arming activity, a reordering of the entire foreign policy of Europe. Since the methods of fascist domestic policy were also applied in german diplomacy, Hitler Germany did indeed offend its Versailles opponents, but nevertheless carried out its aims without delay. An essential success of this policy was the winning of Poland away from allegiance to the french policy. In consequence, Russia saw herself menaced anew on her western boundary. She countered by extending (April 1934)for a period of ten years the non-aggression pacts with the three baltic states. This diplomatic step was hastened by Germany's refusal to sign, as Russia had proposed, a protocol regarding the inviolability of the baltic states.

Entry Into the League of Nations

The Bolsheviks have been and are miles removed from conducting anti-fascist foreign policy. They have been emphasizing for years their good relations with Italy, a country with which, on the grounds of certain anti-german interests held in common, they concluded in September 1933 a new non-aggression and neutrality pact. If the Russians have turned from being an opponent of the League of Nations and made themselves one of its members,if from being an enemy of the Versailles treaty they have become its sponsor, if they have converted Germany from a support to a point of attack of their european diplomacy,-that was determined merely "thru certain changes in the policy of Germany", as Stalin declared at the 17th party congress of the CPSU in 1934. He further expressly stated that this diplomatic turn was not caused by the Fascists. On the contrary: "Certainly, we are far from being charmed by the fascist regime in Germany. Still, it is not a question here of fascism, as may by clear if only because of the fact that fascism in Italy, for example, has not stood in the way of the Soviet Union's establishing the best relations with that country." The question

is in general, he said, merely one of drawing closer to "these or those countries which are not interested in disturbing the peace". With which italian fascism, just as in the minds of certain german pacifists, marches up as a defender of the "peace".

The change of front on the part of bolshevist foreign policy was therefore the consequence of the change of front on the part of german foreign policy. The Russians were zigzagging between the imperialistic Great Powers in order to put thru their "peace policy"; that is, in order to bring about and support that coalition of powers which at any given moment may appear the most reliable for warding off a military attack on the SU and for isolating any aggressive powers---today, Germany and Japan. France, on her part, as the main pillar of the bankrupt Versailles system and, standing next door to Germany, the most directly menaced by Hitler, became one of the main champions of understanding with Russia. She was able to plan her great counter-moves against the new german foreign policy, if not without casualties, still on the whole in accordance with the recipe of a preventive military encircling of Hitler Germany (Poland is a big hole in this ring). In the autumn of 1934, on France's initiative, Russia was invited by 30 states to join the League of Nations. The invitation was opposed by only three of the small european States, which could still afford to preach the rescue of capitalist morality from Bolshevism: fascist Portugal, half-fascist Holland and democratic Switzerland. Pravda of Sept. 18, 1934, gave as the grounds for the invitation into the League of Nations, the fear on the part of the inviting capitalist Powers that "the anti-soviet plans of the adventurist elements among the imperialists might be the prelude to a new world war directed also against a number of imperialist Powers". Izvestia, however, explained on the previous day that the capitalist world is divided into two groups: one which at present wants peace, and another which is looking for the war adventure. The Powers adhering to the League of Nations were henceforth, after the withdrawal of Japan and Germany, regarded as the peace group (Italy-Abyssinia!). Stalin, on his part, explained that with the adherence of Russia, the League of Nations could have a certain braking effect "for postponing or preventing the occurrence of warlike actions". Litvinov, finally, pointed in Geneva to the international cooperation of the SU with the predominant part of the capitalist Powers on the economic, artistic, social, scientific, and political fields, a co-operation which had now been crowned by the common goal of the "organization of peace".

After the impotence of the League of Nations in all questions of assuring the peace and preventing any warlike attacks in all the years of its existence had by

this time been revealed to even the rosiest of the pacifist-optimists, the pacifistic effectualness of the League was at last discovered by the Bolsheviks. Behind their peace protestations there certainly stands a knowledge about the facts. But they are carrying on in capitalist diplomacy, and it demands that offensive as well as defensive military alliances be clothed with pacifist phrases.

While the entry into the League of Nations has brought the Russians a great number of further diplomatic successes, among which the politico-commercial rapprochement with England is rated as one of the most important, practically it has above all legitimized the co-operation between Russia and France. For one thing, Russia was concerned with the continuation of the security policy on her western boundary, so that as early as December 1934 negotiations were started with a view to the eastern pact, which was to be guaranteed primarily by France. These endeavors, which for the present have miscarried, owing to resistance of Germany and Poland, the Russians have not yet given up. The real, essential point of joining the League of Nations is, however, the alliance with France, which doubtless is based upon a military agreement and provides for mutual security against a german aggression.

But, true to the very methods of imperialist diplomacy, Bolshevism from the earliest times of its existence has had two irons in the fire. For a long while the Comintern was this second iron. That, however, is past. Today the Russians are concerned with keeping their hands free for new readjustments of their foreign policy, for broadening and altering their alliance front between the imperialist Powers themselves. This has been confirmed in the first place by their east-asiatic policy, insofar as their dealings there have been with Japan. Since the beginning of the manchurian advance, they have endeavored to come to an understanding with Japan (sale of the Eastern Railway for a song) and to bring about the conclusion of a non-aggression pact. But the european policy of the SU is likewise a policy of attempts at rapprochement with its principal adversaries of the moment. The former cooperation between Russia and Germany is unforgotten in Moscow; unforgotten the speculation on the plans of the bourgeois wing of the Reichswehr generals, which still represents Schleicher's conception of a co-operation with Russia (the imperialistic german bourgeoisie has no desire to conquer a "colonizing land" in the East;it is looking for imperialistic goals). The Bolsheviks are counting upon a possible break-thru of these forces in Germany, Molotov declared at the 7th soviet congress in January 1935 that "we had and have no other desire than to continue maintaining good relations with Germany. Everyone knows that the Soviet Union is filled with a

profound impulse to develop its relations with all States, those with fascist government not excluded". The "ultra-nationalistic race theories" of the National Socialists, Molotov emphasized, "naturally" form no hindrance to the development of the russo-german relations, and added: "Altho we have no very high opinion of these 'theories', we do not conceal our respect for the german people as one of the greatest peoples of the present epoch". The question is merely as to "what precisely is at the basis of the foreign policy of present-day Germany", namely, the question whether Hitler's conception of german foreign policy still holds.

The Inner-Political Presuppositions of the Latest Phase of Russian Foreign Policy

The actual line of russian foreign policy at any given time is thus in large measure determined by the momentary constellation of the imperialist Powers. The measure in which the Bolsheviks carry on this foreign policy depends, however, on their inner forces. And these in turn have recently been subject to significant shifts.

The regime of bolshevist absolutism has passed a critical point. In accord with its origin and its conditions of social equilibrium, in the first period of its development, it supported itself decisively upon the russian working class. The proletariat appeared as the politically and economically privileged (even tho very modestly privileged) class. The absolutistic regime of Bolshevism supported itself predominantly upon the industrial class in order to form a counter-weight to the peasantry, which numerically constituted an unprecedented majority, and in order to build up the industrial state-capitalism at forced tempo. The industrializing of Russia, however, made it possible, in turn, to destroy the private capitalism of the peasants and to collectivize the land. An agrarian collective capitalism arose which, on the one hand, was capable of defending its own interests as against the state apparatus as well as against the working class, and which, on the other, was able to become the supporting foundation for the state apparatus itself.

With the successes of the policy of the second five-year plan, the Bolsheviks have announced the transformation of Russia from an agrarian into an industrial country. Between the years 1928 and 1934 the russian proletariat increased from 17.3 to 28.1 percent of the total population. The number of collective peasants mounted from 2.9 to 45.9 percent, while the number of individual peasants declined from 72.9 to 22.5 percent. The working class, to be sure, still constitutes a minority of the population. However, it is not only highly organized industrially; it also turns out today the predominant part of all soviet

products. This preponderance, however, compels the absolutistic regime of the Bolsheviks to draw up the agrarian class as its main support, to shift the center of gravity of the state apparatus to the weaker side, so as to maintain the equilibrium of the two classes and thereby, for the absolutistic peak of the pyramid, the possibility of governing.

The russian collectivized peasantry becomes the privileged class of the Soviet Union. While the industrial ascent of Russia down to the year 1928 was accomplished at the expense of the peasantry, the collectivizing itself was accomplished at the expense of the proletariat. The billions invested for the sake of russian agriculture had to be withdrawn from the industrial sector of the russian economy, and are in themselves sufficient to explain in large part the tense social situation in which the russian proletariat found itself in spite of all five-year-plan successes. The doing away with bread cards and the succeeding rise in the price of bread was a present to the collectivized peasants, to whom in 1932 Stalin had promised "well being". In the last four years, the government has expended about five billion rubles for organizing the machine and tractor stations, a sum which had to be raised by russian industry. The money indebtedness of the collectives to the State down to the year 1933, amounting to a total of 435 million rubles, was struck off the books at the end of 1934, the money accordingly presented to the peasants as a gift.

Ostensibly, the collective enterprises, as even the Menshevikess Domanevskaya has now discovered, are of socialist character. Stalin had, however, as early as the 17th party congress, declared that the petty-bourgeois equalitarianism of the communes must be liquidated. The agricultural collectives are guilds, which leave considerable play to the collective ownership of the peasant. In Feb. 1935, at the congress of the collective peasants, model statutes drafted by Stalin for the collective enterprises were adopted. These statutes have deeded the land to the collective enterprises for all time, as was declared by the secretary of the Moscow party organization (v. Rundschau, 1935, No. 28). The nationalized soil has been made the private possession of the peasant collectives. "Every collective peasant feels now," the secretary said further, "that the general assembly of the members of a collective economy is master over the collective-economy property, that no 'plenipotentiary' of any sort can exclude him from the collective economy, that he has an equal voice in determining the common affairs of the collective economy." The sharpest tones were adopted in condemning the "absolutely inadmissible blundering intrusions into the life of the collectives" on the part of "certain party organizations", to whom it was made

clear that "people who infringe the collective-economy statutes cannot be tolerated either in the party apparatus or that of the soviets". The collective peasants, unrestricted masters of their properties, were accordingly released from the tutelage of the party organs. The "leading role of the proletariat" over the peasantry was thereby definitively abolished.

And as it has been economically, so also politically. Hand in hand with this astounding reform of the collectives went the abolition of the formal disadvantaging of the peasantry on the political field. The 7th soviet congress introduced equal, direct and secret suffrage and thereby a sort of "soviet parliamentarism" by means of which the weight of the peasantry can be thrown into the scale in all cases of voting. The future soviet congresses will therefore, just like the congresses of the parliaments which are subordinated to them, be dominated by peasant majorities. The peak of the bolshevist state apparatus thereby frees itself from the pressure of the proletariat, a pressure which it once needed in its apparatus but which would now necessarily turn out to be too dangerous for it. For in spite of all dictatorial securities, the soviet regime after all exists only on condition of utilizing the country's mass forces, to which it has to render account simultaneously and between which it has to manoeuver.

The transition of the bolshevist system of absolutism onto the peasantry as its main support meant, however, the deprivileging of the party strata of proletarian origin. It represents, moreover, such a break with the party tradition that it could not come off without producing inner convulsions in the party apparatus, regardless of the fact that this party had already been purged dozens of times. Stalin was obliged once more to oppose his party in order to break its conservatism. He did this with the usual bolshevist ruthlessness, in that he introduced, if not the gradual and complete dismantling of the party apparatus, yet after all the further depoliticizing of the party. If the predominance of the proletarian class in soviet absolutism consisted in the factual superiority of the party apparatus over the state apparatus, while Stalin combined and dominated both, the predominance of the peasantry in the soviet system will bring it about that the state apparatus takes a position above the party apparatus.

So far, this fundamental upheaval has brought forth two measures of the greatest significance. The first was the liquidation of the union of old Bolsheviks; that is, the destruction of the center of the "proletarian"-revolutionary tradition of the CPR. (According to bourgeois press reports, Krupskaya was also taken into custody.)

The second of these measures was the reorganization (as it was shamefacedly expressed) of the Young Communist League. Heretofore, this League was organized according to the "production principle" like the CP itself and anchored in the factories. It rated as one of the party's most spirited weapons in the factories and played an important part there as organizer of the shock brigades, as gatherer of the state loans, etc. It was a lively political instrument of the bolshevist party; perhaps the liveliest, for the youth organization was always at the same time a center of the most various oppositions and an exponent of "bolshevist self-criticism", of which nothing more has been heard for some time. As the relatively weakest link of the party, the Young Communist League had to knock under first. As early as Feb. 22, 1935, hence directly following the 7th soviet congress, which elevated the peasant class to the throne, its "reorganization" was decided upon. This decision was complied with by the June plenum of the central committee of the youth organization. The social-democratic standpoint, that the youth organization has no political, but only educational functions, was here converted into fact. The youth organizations in the factories are being broken up. The YCL is being redistributed into seven sections: working-class youth, peasant youth, young pioneers, students, school children, leading YCL organs, juvenile work of the state and trade organizations. Politically, the YCL is thereby liquidated, and the field that is left to it is the youthful idyl: "Like a provident gardener," writes Pravda in an editorial around the middle of June, "it is called upon to bring up millions of people, to form their view of the world, to instruct, to nourish and to cherish them."

The Liquidation of the Comintern

With the accomplishment of this inner-political turn--the political NEP-turn of Stalin's--the last traditional restraints have fallen which had previously still existed with respect to bolshevist foreign policy by reason of the existence of the communist parties in Europe. The co-operation of russian state-capitalism with the monopolistic and in part openly fascist imperialism is henceforth unimpeded by any exterior consideration whatsoever. The embarrassing revolutionary phraseology can finally be discarded.

Hitherto, the "world revolution" was at least on paper recognized as the first and most essential guarantee against an intervention on the part of imperialist Powers. Practically, the Bolsheviks relied, however, exclusively on their diplomacy and on that institution which was rendered possible with its aid: the highly organized and technicized Red Army. The late acting president of the soviet of people's commissars, Kuibushev, has even

clothed this undisguisedly in words. In January 1935,at the third soviet congress of Moscow, he stated: "While we are fighting for peace on the international arena,we must nevertheless consider that the best assurance against a war, against an intervention, is as before the increasing might of the armed defender of our Fatherland, the Red Army of Workers and Peasants".

Even before this time, the proletarians who joined the communist parties in good revolutionary faith and took upon themselves the martyrdom of the fascist terror no longer counted among the Bolsheviks. In general, they were remembered with declarations of sympathy or protest resolutions which were not allowed to affect in the slightest degree the policy of concluding pacts of peace and friendship between the "Fatherland of all Workers" and their fascist oppressors. Occasionally, however, the hired writers of the Bolsheviks also expressed their sentiments more openly. Thus, on the occasion of the conclusion of the new non-aggression pact with Italy, Peri wrote in the Rundschau (1933, No. 33) with a shameless cynicism of which the equal would no doubt be hard to discover:"On the part of our italian brothers in arms who are suffering in the penitentiaries and on the islands of exile,the fact that their torturers are compelled to deal with the representatives of that revolutionary order for whose triumph the noblest of our comrades have offered up their freedom will be interpreted as an incentive to resistance and to struggle." The communist worker had accordingly long been abandoned when the Comintern was still conducting the "anti-fascist" pseudo-struggle against those Powers which were already tied up in the closest manner with the Soviet Union.

With the latest franco-russian pact, however, in which it was no longer a question of a diplomatic agreement, but of direct military co-operation, the leaders of Bolshevism were obliged to give up even the appearance of a "revolutionary" equivocalness. Obviously, the French insisted upon guarantees against a disturbance policy on the part of the CP of France. Stalin gave them. He assured Laval, on the occasion of his visit to Moscow, that France is naturally obliged to adopt measures in the interest of her military defense. Izvestia wrote on May 16: "The task of the public opinion of both countries is the support of the policy of their governments, which is the policy of peace and of defense."

The pact with France was followed by that with Czechoslovakia, which forthwith adhered to the franco-russian pact by reason of her menaced position between Hitler Germany and contested Austria. The Izvestia presented the grounds for this new alliance (until 1934 no diplomatic relations had existed between the two countries)

in the following words: "German fascism, in order to conceal its policy of conquest, may fashion a theory according to which the slavic peoples supply the manure of history. But the Soviet Union, while taking no stock in any sort of pan-slavic masquerades, vouches in every manner that it deems the defense of the slavic peoples, who are in danger of being attacked, as no less well grounded and worthy of support than is the defense of France".

Since the remaining apparatus of the Comintern parties no longer has any life of its own, the readjustment of their policy to the new situation was not accompanied by the slightest inner difficulties. The policy of military alliances with capitalist States required the liquidation of the disturbance policy of the Comintern parties in the countries in question. Moscow carried out this liquidation, which presages the early end of the european CP's in general. The way to this end is twofold. In the first place, it was necessary that the french and czech parties should swing into the line of national defense. That occurred promptly. Of course, the french CP was faced with the difficult task of combining this line with the traditional anti-militarism of the french working masses. It spoke cautiously and diplomatically. "The mutual assistance embraces the corresponding measures for the defense of peace", wrote Magnien on May 16 in L'Humanite. "In order to preserve the peace, a Bolshevik should do everything", declared Vaillant-Couturier, two days later in the same sheet. He compared the pact with the New Economic Policy (NEP). It was a question, he said, of gaining time in order to postpone the war and protect "our socialist Fatherland". No other reasons, he added, are discoverable in the words of Stalin. Furthermore, it was protested that the CPF remains the defender of the french soldiers and wants to win the army. Practically, however, all that remained to do was to demand that the fascist and reactionary officers be driven out of the army, since one could not after all confide to them the serious defense of the USSR.

In Czechoslovakia, where nationalism on the one hand and the social-democratic tameness of the CP on the other were considerably greater, the matter was rendered easier. Sverma, a newly elected parliamentarian of the CPCz, declared on May 24 at a CP meeting in Prague that the czech communists, in case the czechoslovakian army would fight consistently against german imperialism, would support this struggle and come out for the army. He declared himself in favor of maintaining the independence of the ozech nation, which could be assured by an army purged of fascists.

In order to make this "defence-of-the-fatherland" policy

effectual in the policy of the allied capitalist nations, in harmony with the designs of soviet diplomacy, the Comintern would once more have to seek out the corresponding parliamentary field. That meant practically that the Comintern parties had to be annexed to the Social Democracy of the countries in question. The united front with the heads of "social fascism" became all of a sudden the one and only line-true watchword of the various CP's. In France there arose the "front commun", releasing waves of enthusiasm and fake activity. If the negotiations as a whole did not proceed so smoothly as might have been expected, this was owing to the fact that differences arose regarding the question of the extension of this front. While the CP wanted to draw in even the left-bourgeois parties (if coalition anyhow, then all the way to the democratic bourgeoisie!), the Social Democrats opposed to this their traditional No, and thus acquired among the french workers the reputation of being the most radical, the "leftest" of all the parties. However, Blum, at the congress of his party in Muhlhausen (June 1935) could not deny "that the declarations of Stalin are in accord with the decisions adopted regarding the national defense by the french Socialist Party in Tours three years ago and consequently served the future organizational unity of socialists and communists. In case of a german invasion, all proletarians would rise against the outer enemy, for the defeat of France would mean the defeat of Russia". (NZZ of June 13.) It is quite conceivable that Moscow will even decree the direct liquidation of its european offshoots, if things go still farther. If the Bolsheviks succeed in winning an indirect influence upon the social-democratic parties, without being responsible for them, that will be the most favorable to the plans of Moscow in the present world situation. (This tendency to combine by moving to the side of the Social Democracy is not confined to the Muscovites, but is running thru all the various bolshevist currents. The Trotskists of France, of Switzerland, etc., are already in the Social Democracy, and in other countries they are working in a similar direction. The CPO of Schaffhausen (Switzerland) accomplished its union with the SPS at the beginning of July 1935.)

The procession to the Social Democracy has been followed by the swiss CP without reserve. After a campaign in opposition to the social-democratic and trade-union "crisis initiative", shortly before the vote was taken it issued a call for support of this initiative. The situation, naturally, had "fundamentally changed". The SPS had, to be sure, proposed an extensive elimination of Parliament for the carrying thru of the initiative, but the Federal Council (Bundesrat) had in mind still more extensive full powers for itself. So the CPS preferred, in accordance with the approved social-democratic recipe of the lesser evil, the half to the three-quarter dictatorship. This

tumble was followed by the offer of a united front to the SPS, which in turn was followed by preparations for the dissolution of the red-union opposition (RGO) in Basel. The SPS set five conditions; among others, the liquidation of the RGO and other such separate CP organizations, suspension of all attacks upon the social-democratic policy, particularly upon the social-democratic functionaries in the administrative apparatus, and unconditional assent to the swiss "Plan of Labor". The CPS had as a matter of course to subscribe to all this. It was even obliged to swallow the ironic remark of the SPS executive committee to the effect that at any rate no co-operation with bourgeois parties was involved, such as had been demanded by the french comunists.

Just as down to the year 1932 it was "social fascism", so at the present time the "united front" has become the axis of all CP policy. Bela Kun, in a long article in No. 11 of the "Communist International", analyzed the tactic and the successes of the various CP's on the occasion of the united-front demonstrations on May 1. As to the german question, he expatiated as follows: If the majority of the SPG executive committee in Prague is really trying to support the imperialist war policy of Hitler Germany, in order to get back into the game, then there is need for establishing a much closer contact between the communists and the left members and groups of the SPG, for the creation of "lively examples of the united front" and for strengthening the broad mass pressure upon the SPG executive committee in Prague". These interesting disquisitions demonstrate, first, that the CP must be in very poor standing with the german workers, for otherwise it would not turn to the SPG executive committee after it had declared, following Hitler's victory: The SPG remains the principle enemy. They prove, furthermore, that the Comintern is here "fighting" merely for a bit of influence upon the remaining props of a social-democratic apparatus which history has already shown the door, an apparatus which at the time the Kun article was written was putting an end to the struggle of the "Leftists" for their share of the million marks in the possession of the party's executive committee, in that it threw these latter out of its enterprise for compensating its own services with respect to the german workers. Besides, at the present time the german secret police (Gestapo) has gone a long way in wiping up the illegal SPG apparatus, made further numerous arrests and thus reaped the harvest which had been prepared for it by two spies in the central committee of the SP in Germany. At the moment the SPG central committee, according to our certain information, no longer has any connections whatsoever toward Germany, and has decided not to attempt making any for some months to come.

Conclusion

Thus the foreign policy of the Soviet Union has logically, growing out of the original situation of the russian revolution, ended up as a link in the system of imperialist alliance policy. Corresponding to the momentary needs at the different halting places along this way, it has directed the communist parties, on the back of the european proletariat, up to the point at which their political liquidation in favor of the national-reformist policy of the Social Democracy has already become merely a question of form. This is not taking place without the recent illusionary working up of the "united-front" enthusiasm of a european proletariat which in the present period of universal counter-revolution and reaction has run hopelessly into the blind alley of national limitation. Its further course can only be a further bit-by-bit collapse. A sound class-reaction against the continuing ideological and practical decline is at the moment not yet visible in the european countries even in the most modest beginnings. It appears that Social-democratism and Bolshevism must continue their work of destruction of any proletarian force of action even to the bitter end before the proletarian turn becomes at all possible. But the world situation is overloaded in such a way with economic and political difficulties, counter-forces and contradictions that this proletarian turn will in the long run unavoidably come about. The ruins of all "old" labor "movement" will make the path of the reascent an incomparably painful one, but they will also finally leave it clear.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

A N T I - D U E H R I N G (Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science)

By FRIEDRICH ENGELS

Together with " The Mark" and the author's "Introduction to Socialism, Utopian and Scientific", an historical introduction by the translator, explanatory notes, bibliography and index.

Ranking next to Marx's Capital in its importance to the working-class movement, Anti-Dühring is the most comprehensive of Engel's works. Engels in this polemic was obliged to follow Herr Dühring into all spheres of learning, philosophy, political economy, socialism.

Part I treats with Philosophy. Part II is an outline of and introduction to the three volumes of Capital. Part III explains the basis of modern socialism.

Published by Charles H.Kerr & Company, 341-349 E.Ohio St. Chicago, Ill. (402 pages, $ 2.00 Postpaid)

CURRENT TRENDS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Despite the gradual trend toward equalization of the economic-social structure of Europe, the distinction between industrial capitalist Western Europe and overwhelmingly agricultural Eastern Europe is still apparent. Czechoslovakia reaches into both divisions. Its western part is highly industrialized and its history is closely interwoven with that of middle Europe, while its eastern part embraces the typical agrarian characteristics of eastern Europe. This contradiction between the East and West constitute one important problem of Czechoslovakian politics and economy.

The other problem is that of nationalities. Czechoslovakia is not a unified national state. It is inhabited by approximately ten million Czechoslovaks (Czechs and Slovaks because of different historical background do not yet constitute a unity, although that tendency exists), three and one quarter million Germans, 700,000 Magyars, 400,000 Ukrainians, and 66,000 Poles. The "national antagonism", especially between the Germans and Czechs, is fundamentally but the conflict between more or less independent capitalist groups for a share in the state control, as well as over internal and foreign markets. The larger part of the proletariat as well as the petty bourgeoisie was dragged into this conflict. This national competition seems to be refuted by the interlocking of German and Czech capital in the monopolistic organizations, but in reality the struggle is merely resumed on another plane, within the monopolies.

The economic differences of West and East, and national disunity, existed before the founding of the republic, but the difficulties arising out of the breakup of the old Austrian economic entity developed with the republic. In the old Austria, which formed an economic unity with balanced industrial and agrarian production, industry was centered chiefly in the Sudete countries. (Sudeten: mountain-chain). Excepting that part which found a sale in foreign markets, Austrian industry found a market for its goods in the agricultural belt. What is now Czechoslovakia supplied over 50 percent of all the industrial production of the old Austria - some industries as high as 100 percent. After the breakup of the empire, Czechoslovakian industry retained but a fourth of the former markets, as the other offshoots of the Austrian empire immediately raised tariff walls under whose protection they started their own industries. The export to these former countries, thus impeded, formerly the exclusive domain of Bohemian industry, now also had to meet the sharp competition of the great capitalist countries in these territories, whose position here was now consider-

ably improved.The relative over-industrialization of Czechoslovakia determined economic policies and influenced the relations between the different bourgeois factions.

A number of problems also result from the international position of Czechoslovakia. Deriving its existance as a state from the Versailles treaty, and its basic imperialist setup, any shifting of the then existing powers affects it closely. Czechoslovakia's vulnerable position and its economic implications complicate further the problems arising from its international position and, consequently, also the internal political situation.

All these problems, however, are secondary to the general social antagonisms that also rock the foundations of the other capitalist states. The causes of the apparent confusion in the social conflicts of Czechoslovakia lie in the interlocking and interaction of the general conditions of the world crisis with the special conditions peculiar to the founding and development of the Czechoslovakian state.

The wave of international crisis reached Czechoslovakia from one to one and a half years later than the surrounding countries. Then it progressed sharply and rapidly. First hit and hardest was the export industry,situated almost entirely in the Northwestern border territories inhabited by Germans. In contrast, the industries in the interior largely supplying the internal markets have held up fairly well. Recently published statistics estimated unemployment in thirteen districts preponderantly German, with a total population of 1,068,629, at 119,265; while thirteen districts preponderantly Bohemian, with 1,178,834 inhabitants gave only 51,949 unemployed. Unemployment in the German border districtswas more than twice that of the Bohemian, namely 11.15 percent as against 4.4 percent.

But even the unequal force with which the crisis struck various sections of industry failed to halt the trustification efforts that had been initiated as early as the pre-war period in the Sudeten countries. After the war, this trend continued and by 1933, in the midst of the crisis, there were 538 registered cartels. The vertical organization of industries by the banks has proceeded even more rapidly. Four to five Prague banks, through direct ownership or large investment in the most important industries, control four-fifths of the total Czechoslovakian production.

The growing power of the monopolies is increasingly manifested in politics. Banks and other business concerns, over the heads of the "peoples' representatives", try to use the state apparatus for their momentary interests. For example, it is no secret that the success of the

greatest bank, "Zivnostenska banka", which controls the greatest industrial concern is mainly due to the fact that the financial and trade policy of the state was in the hands of its representatives who ruthlessly subordinated the economic policy of the state to its immediate financial interests, Similarly the agricultural ministers used their office to further the interests of the well concentrated agrarian industry.

In contrast to the era of liberal capitalism, when the state is almost exclusively the instrument of political power of the bourgeoisie, monopoly capitalism now seizes it increasingly for its immediate exonomic purposes. Thus the state exerts its full force upon capitalist production and distribution in order to keep their contradictions within bearable limits and, simultaneously, furthers the monopolistic trend. In a small way as yet this expresses itself in the economic legal measures of the past years, i.e., the wheat monopoly, compulsory lumber syndicate, etc.

Almost at the outset of the crisis, following the elections, a coalition government was formed, consisting of Czech Agrarians, National-Democrats, People's Party, National Socialists (Benes), the Czech and German Social-Democrats and the German Land League. The government tried to counteract the growing difficulties with the usual deflationist methods ; (salary reductions for government employees, reducing the budget, etc.), which, of course, merely intensified the crisis. From the first, the government, due to its heterogeneous composition, could not reckon on more thoro measures. When the advancing crisis nevertheless indicated the necessity of such measures, open disagreement broke out in the coalition. The group urging a devaluation of the crown to revive the export trade had a majority but met stiff resistance by the National Democrats, representing finance capital and the importers of foreign raw materials who felt their interests endangered by currency devaluation. Before the passing of the devaluation laws, this group demonstratively withdrew from the government. The remaining government parties now formed a closer coalition of agrarian and reformist parties. Resulting from this close co-operation were a number of "planned economy" reforms (grain monopoly, public works loans, public works programs, etc.), which was to culminate in a sort of state capitalism (for example, the nationalization of mines.)

The new reformistic practice of the labor parties now found its ideological expression in the theories of "planned economy". A theoretical re-orientation further became necessary with the collapse of the German (in Germany) social democracy, the chief representative of

the traditional reformism of the Second International. In order to win the vaccillating masses of petty bourgeoisie and farmers for the interests of the reformist labor movement, a "class-coalition" was sought in the formation of a bloc surrendering all class characteristics for the purpose of effecting the structural (state capitalist) reform of capitalism. The labor movement, demoralized by the collapse of the middle European labor parties, through this program was to be shown a new way out, while at the same time a mass basis for the struggle against Fascism would be formed.

The National-Socialist victory in Germany had far-reaching consequences for the internal and external politics of Czechoslovakia. It now found itself adjacent to a state from whose imperialist urge for expansion it had everything to fear. Its immediate reaction to provocative advances of Germany was a closer support of French imperialism and, consequently, of Russia (diplomatic recognition, non-aggression and military assistance pact) as well as closer connection with the states of the little entente. A further effect on foreign policy was clouding of diplomatic relations with Poland which had established friendly relations with German imperialism.

The ideological result of Hitler-German activity was an intensified nationalism by the Czechoslovakian bourgeoisie which could operate under the mask of anti-fascism. In the reformist labor parties, Hitlerism resulted in a panicstricken flight to the institutions of the "democratic" state as refuge from the fascist wave. The anti-fascist struggle represented no struggle between groups fighting for their definite capitalist interests, but a struggle for the preservation of certain governmental principles. Followed to its logical conclusion this conception leads to the support of a war of prevention "in order to bring freedom (at the point of French and Czech bayonets) to Germany".

Internally the Hitler overturn in Germany led to the dissolution of the German National-Socialist Labor Party and the German National Party. The leaderless and partyless fascist masses sought and found cover in the German Turnerbund whose social structure and aims most closely approximated those of the dissolved parties and thus was best fitted to act as a substitute organization for the old swastika parties. Its membership was fairly identical with that of the two outlawed parties, in addition to a powerful reserve of youthful elements that had been radicalized and thrown into politics by unemployment and the crisis. The political character of the Turnerbund was indistinguishable from that of a swastika party. Hypernationalism, anti-Semitism and close petty bourgeois connections characterized both. This similarity to the

old fascist parties threatened to result in the prohibition of the Turnerbund as well, so a form of organization equally capable of carrying on the fascist campaign and yet sufficiently camouflaged to avoid dissolution under the anti-fascist laws had to be found. The most essential fascist activities were to be carried out illegally, in underground agitation, whispering campaigns, etc.

The needs of Czech fascism thus found expression in the organization of the Sudete Home Front (SHF) which soon boasted of a following greater than that enjoyed by the former National-Socialist organizations. In cnntradiction to swastika traditions, the SHF professed a burning love of democracy and international peace; innumerable loyalty demonstrations for the Czechoslovak state were organized and every connection with the forbidden parties, and especially with the Third Reich was avoided. Thus equipped the SHF was the more active in advocating the ideology of its predecessors although in diluted form but enriched with the freshly imported "people's community religion" and a leader cult centered around one Konrad Henlein, a Turnerbund functionary who was being primed as a Sudete German Hitler.

The new foreign policy of Russia after the Nazi revolution in Germany led to a change in the communist tactics in the countries of Russia's allies. In Czechoslovakia this tactic met with difficulties as the government Socialist parties emphatically refused union with the Communists; on the other hand, the united front here would have signified the Communist endorsement of the government which so far seemed imopportune to them. But concessions in this direction have already been made by the CPC.

In May 1935, when the diplomatic bonds between Russia and Czechoslovakia were tightened by a military assistance pact, the CPC declared itself ready to co-operate with the bourgeois parties in parliament and to defend the capitalist state. Parliamentary Representative Sverma on May 24, 1935 declared: "...German Fascism can be defeated only thru class war within Germany and, by war, thru armed force. The Czechoslovak Communists in case of consistent war by the army against German imperialism would support that war and the army". "We are for the maintenance of independence of the Czechoslovak nation", he added, "which can be guaranteed by a strong army, freed of Fascist elements in which workers enjoy all political privileges. We demand the restoration of the suffrage to the members of the army. We urge the Socialist parties to form an <u>oppositional united front</u> to carry on the fight against Fascism. We <u>will support the Socialist parties in the government in all measures intended to combat Fascism</u>, and to secure

concrete advantages for the workers. In foreign policy we will support everything intended to support the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union and to frustrate the war plans of Hitler-Germany."

The complicated transitional character of the general social situation is reflected in the results of the last elections (May 1935). The total result is undeniably a swing to the right. Also, the difference of social development in German and Czech Czechoslovakia becomes more apparent. While conditions among the Czechs seem to have remained about the same, among the Germans there occurred a complete political overturn. The tremendous growth of the Sudete German Home Front to the strongest party in the state formed the real sensation of the elections and gained importance far beyond the boundaries of the state.

The swing to the right is seen in the loss of votes and parliamentary seats of the proletarian parties which altogether now have 14 seats less than formerly. Compared to 41.6 percent of all seats held formerly, they now control only 35.6 percent. The full developments are not so apparent in these totals as a study of the individual national groups reveals.

Changes among the Czechs, despite the sixth year of crisis, are so insignificant that the stability of the old party system seems to be exceptional when compared to international developments in general.

In contrast to the largely German border territories, the inner part of Czechoslovakia, especially Slovakia, is but little industrialized. Such industry as exists is largely for domestic consumption and was hardly affected by the crisis. Besides, industry in the Czech interior has experienced an entirely different development from that of the border districts. The latter are part of the west European economy which had its decisive development in the last half of the 19th century. Now, as formerly during its rise, industry in the border districts follows the decline of Europe's capitalist west. But the agricultural Czech interior belongs to the European east which experienced a period of industrialization after the war. Political independence, the accompanying tariff and trade barriers, now separating the old economic units, led to the development of an economy serving various political and military interests arising out of the new setup that centered more in the interior and the east. This industrial development further moderated the effects of the crisis on this section of Czechoslovakia which had suffered least from the first because of the structural nature of interior and eastern economy. Also, the munitions industry located in the Czech districts and operating at high capacity for years reduced unemployment of the Czech

workers. Consequently, the fascist ideology, the ideology of capitalist decline, remained negligible among the Czech masses.

Thus the comparatively insignificant effects of the crisis on the Czech districts produced no radical change in the traditional party system. However, the crisis still had enough effect in the Czech districts to cause the formation of rudimentary fascists groups that already have expressed themselves in the elections. Czech fascism so far consists of two tendencies: the National Union (Marodni sjednoceni), and the Fascist Party of Gajda.

The reasons for the growth of Fascism, however, are in the economic conditions of the Sudete-German districts. The crisis here manifested itself in an extraordinary impoverishment of the masses. The decline of the highly developed export industry of the border districts struck down the whole economy and social life. The ruin of the export industry involved that of all other branches of production. Important production centers of finished goods, textiles and glass are veritable industrial cemeteries. Even better situated districts such as the soft coal mines in the northwest and the connected industries show a severe decline and unemployment problem. Some industries have been idle for years with no hope of resuming operations. The industrial shifts of the post-war period on the continent, and overseas the tariff,valuta and autarchic policies of most countries have destroyed a whole series of industries. Frequently the paralyzed plants are broken up and transferred to other countries (textile industry), a part of the border industry is moving into the interior leaving an army of unemployed without hope ever to be re-employed, certain only of continuing life under the most miserable conditions.

But those remaining employed fare little better. The wages, already low before the crisis (among the lowest in all Europe), have so far been reduced to an average 50 percent. Short-time employment is the rule,(one day a week in many plants and others close down for weeks on end), and contributes to lowering the living standard of the employed almost to the level of that of the unemployed.

The chief strength of the fascist movement, its very foundation, consists of the mass of the impoverished petty bourgeoisie and peasantry. The decline of the export industry, partly of a petty bourgeois nature, poor business in general, reduced purchasing power of the masses, taxation, etc., brought small tradesmen, merchants, and the craftsmen to the verge of ruin. The young intelligentsia found no more room in the declining

economy and saw every opportunity of rising barred to it. The German small farmers in the less fertile border districts were injured by the agrarian measures of the in favor of large farmers government. These groups that usually turn to the state for help in a crisis had scant hope from a state that furthered the rising Czech competition that threatened them.

The Germans in Czechoslovakia see the solution to their troubles in Fascism. The Sudete German party has had a degree of success unprecedented in fascist history. It polled 70 percent of the German vote, not only thru reduction of the other bourgeois parties, but thru great inroads into the support of both proletarian parties. The confidence of Henlein's followers in finding what seemed to them new and basic methods for their relief thru the People's Commonwealth(Volks-gemeinschaft), social and national utopias, public works program to employ 300,000 Sudete-German unemployed, and similar proposals, gave an immense impetus to their propaganda. Their apparently revolutionary demand for a change in the political,economic and cultural setup was opposed by the Social-Democrats with the conservative slogan of the defense of democracy in the state and a few social-political crumbs. In view of the terrible misery of those affected, that meant merely the retention and defense of their misery. Consequently large parts of the working class, tired of the unsuccessful reform policy of the Social-Democrats, and the sterile phrase-mongering of the Communists, set their hopes in the new rising movement whose spirit and far-reaching demands promised a decided improvement in their lot. Only with all these contributing factors was it possible for the Sudete-German Home Front to overcome the strong socialist traditions and to become the strongest party of Czechoslovakia.

The election results of the Communists also demand attention. There are a number of differences between the CCP and those of the other European countries. The Czech Social Democracy from which it sprang in pre-war times already had been one of the rightest parties of the second international, supporting the position of unconditional co-operation with all classes of the nation. There was practically no Marxian opposition in its ranks. After 1918, following the national revolution which retained all other features of capitalism, a radical tendency developed which, however, lacked a fundamental,revolutionary orientation. It was similar to the Independent Socialist Party tendency in Germany though stronger reformistic and nationalistic tendencies existed here. But while the third international has split the Independent S.P. in order to exclude the too reformistic elements, shortly after it accepted the whole Czech Left bag and

baggage. Junction of the Czech with the German Communists of the country, ideologically more advanced owing to a different historical background, added little to theoretical unity and clarity though a degree of uniformity in concepts and tactics took place thru the years. The lack of theoretical clarity among the party membership formed the basis for frequent serious internal crises that convulsed the party structure until the strong party bureaucracy succeeded in enforcing the strong discipline and rules of Bolshevik organization. Yet, to this day, the party apparatus must compromise with the ideological backwardness of the membership. Thus the policy of the party central committee consists of constant shifting between the now reformistic, now radical desires of the membership on the one hand, and the pressure of the Comintern for defense of the state interests of Soviet Russia on the other hand, though Russian interests more and more tend to support the reformism of the party. This shifting soon became the characteristic of the whole policy of the CCP which evaded all fundamental decisions of theory or practice.

In distinction to the Social-Democracy, the Communist movement in Czechoslovakia is not organized into national groups, but embraces members of all nationalities in one unit. The peculiar national composition of Czechoslovakia explained previously, expresses itself in the thought and action of the various groups and only with due consideration to this can the Communist election results be correctly estimated.

The Communists secured a total increase of 96,289 votes as compared to 1929, or 12.78 percent. As the number of votes had increased by 11.45 percent, the percentage of increase was only 1.33 percent.

The growth of the Communist, almost entirely in eastern Slovakia and Karpatho-Russia, can be traced to the almost complete absence of industry. Even agriculture there is very backward. Conditions generally approximate those of the Balkans and a number of east-European states. The greater part of the population suffers much as a result of the backward social conditions and the ruthless exploitation and oppression by the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie.

Although the remnants of feudalism had been removed by the land reform--the expression of the bourgeois revolutionary character of the Czech national revolution--and the Czech peasantry had become conservative, sufficient vestiges or feudalist conditions remained in the east to maintain the desire for a bourgeois reconstruction of agriculture. The smallness of the farms, infertility of the soil, dependence on the few but all-powerful landed proprietors, and the backwardness of their productive methods, coupled with ad-

ministrative oppression (taxes, tax foreclosures, political chicanery, etc.,--this part of the country is treated almost like a colony) have created misery that is almost unbearable. Communist success here is due primarily to the protest of the peasant population against these conditions. In addition it is the expression of the agrarian-revolutionary ferment of the peasantry of this as well as other eastern countries as the Communist Party unreservedly supports all interests of the peasant population. To the Karpatho-Russian peasants, as to the Russian peasants, the Communist party appears as the sole leader of their social and national struggle.

In Czechoslovakia the crisis appeared later than in the other countries, and earlier in the border districts than in the interior and eastern parts of the republic. The political effects were the later and unequal process of fascization. Following the later outbreak of the crisis, it may be assumed that the low point will be reached at a later period than in other countries. The momentary stabilization of the crisis in Czechoslovakia has obviously not occurred at its lowest point. A further, possibly sudden, collapse is to be expected, especially in the Czech districts. The political effect of a further collapse undoubtedly will be a greater and more effective fascization of the country.

The rise of a real fascist movement among the Czechs must intensify the problem and danger, but also the difficulties, of Fascism in the republic. So long as Fascism was essentially the affair of the minority nation, the decisive policies of the government were but little influenced by it. With the rise of fascism in the majority nation, all internal problems (above all, that of the relationship of the two main nationalities, which may result in a struggle to determine the dominance of the two fascist movements) renewed and intensified will become the order of the day.

The conquest of the state by the monopolistic great-bourgeoisie proceeds more rapidly than the formation of a mass basis for the petty bourgeoisie. The horizontal and vertical trusts embrace owners of both nations and all fractions and constantly expand their operations. In the International Industrial Association (SVAZ PRUMYSLNIKU) for example, the bourgeoisie has an instrument equally potent politically as economically thru which, forced by economic necessity, it demands with increasing insistence absolute control of economy and the state, violently demands the abolition of democratic vestiges and forces thru more and more measures for the fascist reorganization of the state. The time is rapidly approaching when the bourgeoisie with its trusts can exercise unlimited control of the state and thru it dictate its political

and economic measures. But even in the unified dictatorship of monopoly capital, the rivalry of the two national capitalist groups and the different capitalist fractions (industrial, agrarian and finance capital) will continue. The conflict for a share in the fascist rule will flame anew in the economic associations and the state bureaus and administrations. In this struggle, the various national groups of capitalists will seek allies among the petty bourgeoisie of their own country ruined by capital concentration and crisis. Nationalism is the inevitable basis for a fascist mobilization of the petty bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia. To large sections of the petty bourgeoisie, the maintenance and extension of their reduced basis for existence will appear possible only at the expense of the other nationals. Thus the intensified crisis will widen the gulf between the two large nations of the state and finally two strong fascist mass movements will confront each other in an embittered struggle. But as fascism indicates the greatest centralization of state power in the hands of the ruling class, and every independent movement within the regime that conflicts with the interests of the ruling fascism becomes a menace for the whole dictatorship, fascism is confronted with the insoluable problem of chaining the very forces it is constantly forced to unchain. Just as the growing class antagonisms constantly force the fascist state to adopt more rigorous measures to maintain its supremacy, so the growing and diverging forces of the nationalities will necessitate increased pressure by the state. The exact manner in which Fascism will try to reconcile the national conflicts with absolutist state centralization cannot be foretold as yet. A part probably will be played by the state bureaucracy whose great power, uncontrolled chicanery and ruthlessness already indicate its possible position.

In general, fascization is a manifold contradictory process that will be even more conplicated and difficult of comprehension in the Czechoslovak state of conflicting nationalities than elsewhere. The working class is inactive and helpless in relation to the task of revolutionizing the capitalist system. It confronts the powerful new problems with the traditional methods, organizations and ideologies that arose from almost entirely different conditions, and which are completely insufficient to stop the onslaught of the class enemy. The greatest and deciding part of the working class is still in the camp of reformism. Attempts to change the policies of the reformist parties among the Czechs are not apparent, while but a weak tendency in this direction is noticeable among the Germans. What oppositional activity exists within the German Social Democracy is very indefinite and is rather a sign of disintegration of the old ideology than a new orientation. Among all these efforts, the group known as the "Socialist Action" has assumed the most definite forms and gained the most influence. Although

membership in this group is forbidden to party members, and representatives of "Socialist Action" can agitate illegally and under cover, only certain parts of their program have influenced definite, not uninfluential party circles. The ideology of "Socialist Action" is made up of a mixture of plan-reformistic, Bolshevist and fascist elements. No uniform development tendencies are discernible because it harbors too many contradictory trends. Opposed to its "radical bolshevist ideology", its character on the basis of most of its program planks and methods discloses a strong fascist strain. Of course within the oppositional forces of reformism, especially among the youth, there are numerous elements honestly seeking a really revolutionary method. However, all too often their lack of clarity makes them the tools for the centrist or half-bolshevik aims of the experienced opposition politicians.

The other wing of the labor movement, that of the Communists, has long ceased to represent a revolutionary factor. Their great turn-about shift, occurring just during the last election, that they were compelled to make in the diplomatic interests of the Soviet Union has stripped them of the last bit of revolutionary significance. Now that they have committed themselves to national defense and, with certain reservations, to support of the government policy (in their repeated united front proposals to the Social Democrats they have emphasized these willing concessions) their fundamental line is undistinguishable from that of the reformists. Like the latter, they have become a conservative factor in the state. Committed to support the ruling political system, even before formation of parliamentary "anti-fascist united front", they, like the Social Democrats, will be involved in the state collapse. More unsteady ideologically and far less prepared organizationally than its Reichs-German sister party, the Czechoslovak Communist party too must collapse miserably in the coming attack of the class enemy.

On the whole, it becomes apparent that even the so-called "island of democracy" will be unable to arrest the international process of fascization. The same developments here as elsewhere will shake the existing organizations and ideologies of the working class, At first this expresses itself in parliamentary defeats as a result of which must come the recognition that the historic task of the proletariat cannot be accomplished thru parliamentary-reformistic and bolshevist methods and organizations. In the further course of fascization, the bourgeoisie, obeying the political and social imperatives of this process, must put an objective end to the parliamentary labor organizations of all tendencies. This objective end of the contemporary labor movement does not mean its subjective end, however. For, despite the destruction of their organizations by the class enemy, the old ideology will continue to survive among sections of the masses. The intensified oppression and exploitation, however,

destroys the old ideology and prepares the basis for new class action and class consciousness. Sooner or later the class activity thus developed must result in a new organization and ideology adapted to the changed conditions. The practice of the class struggle itself will necessitate organizations in which the militancy of the masses finds direct expression and in which the germs of the new society can be developed. A truly revolutionary ideology must come on the basis of this practice in combination with the total experience of previous class struggles. This new working class ideology can have no room for the illusion of a reformist transformation of existing society, nor for the idea of passive subordination of the classes under the leadership and control of an "advanced guard" and their mobilization for objectives incompatible with their class interests. But, most important, every revolutionary ideology, particularly in nationalistic Middle and Eastern Europe, will have to include and maintain an uncompro ising internationalism.

.....

o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o

.....

Council Correspondence recommends:

The Scientific Method of Thinking. An Introduction to Dialectical Materialism . By Edward Conze.
Chapman & Hall Ltd. - London 1935 -(168 pages; S.5/)

.....

R E A D :

Rätekorrespondenz ,(theoretisches- und Diskussionsorgan für die Rätebewegung).
Herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommunisten (Holland)

EINZELNUMMER 10 ¢ .

THE INEVITABILITY OF COMMUNISM
A critique of Sidney Hook's Interpretation of Marx
25 ¢

THE MODERN MONTHLY, an independent radical magazine .
25 ¢ a copy

Leninism or Marxism, by Rosa Luxemburg 10 ¢
The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism 10 ¢
World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution? 10 ¢
order from: Council Correspondence-1304 N. California Ave. Chicago, Ill.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

ELECTION YEAR

The Miners' Strike in Belgium

BOOM with Twelve Million Unemployed

THE "VICTORY" IN SPAIN

WORKERS' COUNCILS

Book Reviews

Vol. II **No. 5**

APRIL 1936

1.00 YEARLY 10c A COPY

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

.·. Published at 1604 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois .·.

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

E L E C T I O N Y E A R

1.

It has long since been recognized that one capitalist kills many, but under the Roosevelt regime the matter has been subject to fantastic complications. The small capitalists on their way to extinction attribute to Roosevelt the design of bringing all private property under state control. A part of the big bourgeoisie feels called upon to exert an oppositional pressure in order to force the Administration more in its own direction. These attacks from the side of certain capitalist strata furnish occasion for the bureaucratic-liberalistic elements to support Roosevelt in his "fight against the money bags".Meanwhile, the truly dominant capitalist element goes calmly about its affairs, and while on the one hand eliminating the scurvy competition, at the same time hits upon measures for providing the government with instruments for use against the workers. The middle class, the workers and the small capitalists are continually confusing friend and foe, and the horde of political hacks here at work not only lives on this general confusion, but makes it still greater. The apparently liberalistic, class-conciliating Roosevelt program, once enacted into law, is promptly declared unconstitutional and practically given up. The Supreme Court has apparently more power than the Administration and Congress put together, which willingly bow to its dictatorship. The Administration has in this way kept

a large number of its promises, without being obliged to suffer the disappointments of seeing them realized. The comedians of the "New Deal" play their parts splendidly; their demagogy serves skillfully to veil the fact that what passes for enmity between the Administration and the Supreme Court is merely a matter of one hand washing the other.

The Supreme Court takes its stand on the Constitution, which in general has now become quite popular. All the reactionary elements rush to the defense of that venerable document, which can be twisted to serve any interest and which by no means stands in the way of the interests of monopoly. Governor Landon, the most colorless of the presidential candidates and whose animal seriousness remains in full force regardless of all his wheeling the baby carriage, says quite correctly that "the american constitution was devised exclusively for protecting the interests of minorities against unreasonable majorities"; a trait which it shares with all constitutions, and no other sort of constitution is even conceivable. Any change of the constitution can only be a legal modification for assuring more intensified exploitation and is of interest to no one except the exploiters. Whatever the bourgeoisie may have in mind doing with their constitution cannot be other than a matter of indifference to the workers.

The greater the degree in which the control of economy has to be centralized and the greater the degree in which Capital and State are merged into a unity, the more vigorous must be the protest of the forgotten men and the more sharply rages the struggle for the influential posts in the governmental machine; though the same tasks and possibilities are given to and imposed upon each of the competing groups, until this competitive struggle sinks out of sight in the framework of the Totalitarian State. The struggle among the political trucksters for the State positions becomes mixed up so much with the actual conflicts of the various capitalist groups of interests that none of the participants really knows any more what he is actually saying.

The Roosevelt Administration, being hell-bent for re-election, promises each of the special groups what is of use to the group, without regard for the fact that the party thus becomes involved in irreconcilable contradictions. To the liberal elements it promises the continuation of the deceptive, class-conciliating policy; to the workers, freedom to organize and social legislation; to the farmers, the continuation of aid to agriculture; and at the same time it calms the reactionary element with the promise of keeping the taxes as low as possible, of balancing the budget, of allowing business more elbow room, etc. These promises are no sooner made than they

are tagged by the Republicans as Fascism or Communism, tho this does not prevent the Republicans from going before the voters with practically the same program, in a somewhat different form. For the competitors are clear on the point that both, Democrats and Republicans, as in the past, so also in the near future, can only perform the same work; that in spite of all modifications determined in conformity with party needs, in the final analysis they are after all obliged to follow the economico-political necessities which automatically promote the interests of those whose interests are being promoted even today. As concerns the workers, it's Tweedledum and Tweedledee; they have no reason to be concerned about the question of which of the competing parties stands sponsor for the capitalist economy.

The chances of Roosevelt's reelection are very good. The present Administration has some decisive capitalist groups on its side, in spite of the strong capitalist propaganda against individual phases of the Roosevelt policy. Roosevelt still has behind him, without doubt, a large part of the farming element and of the middle class, and certainly the mass of the workers. This happy position of the Democrats spurs the Republicans to undertaking against Roosevelt a campaign of demagogy the like of which has rarely been seen even in the corrupt political struggles of this american scene. From the general confusion this demagogy has created a state of absolute idiocy. No one knows any more today what is right, left, up or down. Fascists fight against Fascism, communists against Communism. Politics has apparently reached the level of Gertrude Stein.

2.

But this is only apparent and represents, no doubt, a transitory stage of the socio-economic development. The truth seems rather to be that as yet the american scene is lacking in real honest-to-god fascists, tho it has a variety and profusion of <u>half</u>- fascists perhaps surpassing that of any other equal area of the globe. These here in the U.S.A. who would seem to be the nearest of spiritual kin to the fascists--such as the Ku Kluxers and other haters and baiters of everybody and everything "foreign"--are after all mostly lacking in one very important element: they lack the reforming, the real crusading zeal of the foreign fascists. In other words, the nearest approach to fascist material in this country is really <u>too reactionary</u> to qualify as such. It has all the <u>prejudices</u> of the fascists, but still one besides, and this one is fatal to the spiritual unity of its makeup. Our pseudo-fascists, that is, are still too strongly and strictly attached to the past and everything by which it is symbolized--laissez-faire capitalism, the Constitution, etc. They are not content with preserving capitalism <u>ueberhaupt</u>, but want to pre-

serve it in the one particular form to which they have always been accustomed. This is a purely petty-bourgeois phenomenon--a pseudo- or half-fascism--and limited, of course, to the more benighted strata even of the petty-bourgeoisie. It is looked upon with contempt by the more or less educated elements of this class; and it can hardly appeal to any great number of the workers, if only because these latter have suffered too much from capitalism in its present form. In short, the american "fascists"are still half-baked; they haven't yet suffered enought to have their conservatism broken; they have fallen in with only the negative or the savage aspects of fascism. They have emotions and fetishes, but no thoughts worth mentioning and no ideals. They are oriented exclusively toward the past, and insofar as they have a vision of the future it is nothing more than a distorted image of the stage on which their grandfathers strutted. They would seem to be well represented in contemporary public life by the present governor of Georgia, "Ol' Gene" Talmadge.

At the other pole we have half-fascists of a quite different sort who have taken over only the more intellectual or pretentious part of the fascist program; planned capitalist economy, "share the wealth", "Epic", incomes of $2,000 up per year for everyone who will work, confiscation of idle mills and factories, etc., etc. These people may be found in (or recently out of) all the political parties, inclusive of those adhering to one or the other of the Internationals, tho with the possible exception of the G.O.P., which at least to all appearances is still living in the good old days of William Mc Kinley, and doesn't know or refuses to recognize that the world has ever moved since. The best and most typical representative of this category of half-fascists was no doubt the late Huey Long, who lacked, however, the fanaticism of a Hitler and the marxian (or labor) background of a Mussolini. But all in all, these people are probably doing more to promote the prospects of fascism in America than are the pure bigots of the first category, because they are more intelligent and tend to invest the popular reformist illusions with a halo of respectability.

Then, of course, there is still a third type of half-fascists, of which the Republican Party itself furnishes the most illuminating examples. They have really no respect for either half of the fascist hodge-podge; they are interested in fascism only as the lesser evil, and will wait for communism to develop before reconciling themselves to such concessions as "planned economy". They genuinely despise the mob emotions associated with fascism, but many of these people (Hearst, Hoover, et al) are themselves adepts in arousing those emotions for the protection of their own interests--appealing particularly to the prejudices of the petty-bourgeois rabble--and have

to be reckoned with in case of a real contest.

But as yet there is no fusion of the types into a single individuality such as makes the true fascist leader. And the circumstance that such a personality has not yet appeared on the american scene is only a further indication that the crisis here has not yet reached the critical point. Meanwhile the confusion will no doubt remain as great as at present; the incipient fascists will continue to fight among each other, the "communists" will go on with their projects for forming the "Farmer-Labor" party and make themselves more and more indistinguishable from the fascists and other bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, and the pot will continue to call the kettle black.

Of one thing, however, we need not entertain any doubt, and that is that there is a much closer bond of spiritual and material affinity at least among the leaders of these various categories of still only half-fascists than might appear from their calling of names and their mutual incriminations and recriminations in the course of a presidential campaign. This is sufficiently indicated by the fact that Talmadge--that staunch upholder of the Constitution--is one of the strongest friends and admirers of the late Huey Long, while Huey in turn was at least until the last year or so of his life one of the greatest admirers of Roosevelt and his break with Roosevelt had nothing to do with any disregard of the Constitution. In reality, none of them cares a hang for the Constitution except insofar as it serves the interests of the american bourgeoisie and as a symbol of its power. The great object is that of preserving capitalism; if that object can be promoted by the constitution fetishism, well and good; otherwise, the Constitution will go by the board. Talmadge is just as willing, not to say eager, to violate some parts of the Constitution--particularly the "Bill of Rights"--as Roosevelt is inclined to disregard others. The difference is largely a matter of opinion as to which parts it is most advisable to disregard or to violate at the present stage of development. The real quarrel which most of the bourgeoisie has with Roosevelt is that he is too much inclined, in itd view, to conciliation and the dispensation of relief for keeping down discontent. The bourgeoisie in general feels that such a policy involves a needless drain upon its income, that the unemployed are being "spoiled" and taught to expect too much, that at least for the present its slaves can be kept in subjection more economically by the army and the police, which are being paid for the purpose anyhow.

3.

The Republican front is less unified than one would be led to think from the way it shouts. And the Democratic

Party, also, is innerly disintegrated. The fact that the various administrations tend more and more to fuse with the ruling capitalist groups and are less and less susceptible of being regarded as the executive organ of all capitalists,--such a situation splits even the old parties and leads to intensified efforts to found a new party.

The capitalist groups neglected by the Roosevelt Administration and which hitherto have backed the Democratic Party set up new organizations such as the "American Liberty Deague" in order to represent their interests better. In the Republican Party, the "young elements" turn against the reactionary traditions of the party in order to increase its power of competition. Groups of interests cut loose from both parties and establish contact with such skeleton organizations as already exist and which are intended to lead to a new "third party". The viability of such a new organization is, however, hindered just as much by the present relations, which are headed for dictatorship, as its formation was hitherto precluded by the previous political system. So that ever and ever again there is a new attempt to harmonize the particular tendencies within the two-party system.

Liberalism, as the intellectual expression of competitive capitalism, is incapable of maintaining itself along any other path than the one by which it is doomed eventually to be destroyed. Tho finding itself economically in contradiction to the Roosevelt regime, Liberalism is politically condemned to support it. Conversely to the usual order of things, we here find the victim serving his hangman with the last meal before going to the gallows. By means of the liberalistic propaganda, the Roosevelt regime has succeeded in winning the great mass of the workers, so that in the coming elections also the gain of the parliamentary labor parties will be at most an insignificant one, if any. The outcome of the elections will show once more that the influence of the parliamentary labor movement upon american democracy is slighter than the jokes of Mae West. The trade-union leaders, who logically function within the framework of the capitalist parties, still find it very easy to mobilize the entire trade-union movement for Roosevelt. in spite of all the previous disappointments which his Administration has brought the workers. The last convention of the United Mine Workers of America went down deep in its pockets for the Roosevelt campaign fund and decided unanimously to vote for this best representative of industrial unionism. The secretary of the U.M. of A. proudly announced: "Let our vote for Roosevelt be our answer to the money bags of Wall Street." But they had decided only against the small and for the bigger money bags.

The demagogy put to use in present-day american politics is, as a matter of fact, distracting and hard to fathom.

When big capitalists like Mellon, Raskob, Morgan, Du Pont are dragged before investigating committees in order to disclose the secrets of economics and politics; when at all conferences of the manufacturers and bankers protests are made against measures of the Roosevelt regime,--can the layman come to any other conclusion than that Roosevelt is actually carrying on in opposition to Capital? What the administration, in the interest of its reelection, has to exert pressure upon individual capitalist groups, and is compelled to favor others, that it has to draft tax programs that bring results, and that the menacing war makes it necessary to clean up the armament industry and to bring about a national coordination of the international credit policy,--such obvious things vanish behind the sensational interpretations put upon them by the press. People fail to see that it is precisely the strengthening of the capitalist and military positions, not the longing for peace and a sound national economy, that lies at the basis of the activity of these investigating committees.

However, it is not the propaganda for or against Roosevelt that will decide in the last instance the victory of the one or the other party. The fact that success was attained under the Roosevelt Administration in holding up temporarily the economic decline, and in stabilizing the system for a time at a certain crisis level, assures the administration sufficient sympathy so that its reelection is highly probable. The time before the election is too brief to preclude, even in view of the new worsening of the economic situation which is nowunder way, an artificial prolongation of the present stagnation. The economic breathing spell attained by way of credit inflation and intensified technical rationalization can still be prolonged somewhat and enable Roosevelt to win the race again. But behind the credit inflation looms the unconcealed inflation of the currency, the complete expropriation of the middle class and intensified pauperization of the workers. Tho open inflation is less seductive in the United States than in most countries, owing to the high degree of amalgamation between debtors and creditors, it is nevertheless within the realm of the probabilities in view of the impossibility of sharp and sudden turns in the field of economy and politics. The danger of inflation is being played up stronger than ever by the opposition to Roosevelt. With or without inflation, however, the present economic policy is speculating on better times; even today it is living on the hoped-for profits of the future. If these fail to appear, the present program is bound to capsize and will be abandoned even as a phrase. Politics will then become as brutal as economics ever is, and the "Savior of the people" must then become an "Enemy of the people".

But all the election shouting can be of interest only to those whose thoughts are turned in the capitalist direc-

tion. As regards the parliamentary labor movement, this is bound up with recognizing in principle the capitalist system and its State, and also with the hope of deriving from the parliamentary table a few paltry crumbs."Leaders must eat"; that is the final ground for the parliamentarism of the present-day labor movement. Even tho there are only a few parliamentary positions, still one can bring in more membership contributions with a parliamentary than with an anti-parliamentary program. Whichever way they may vote, the workers will always find in the last instance that they have only made their choice between parasites and exploiters. As for us, we attach no special importance to the question of who exploits us; the thing that we are concerned with is the doing away with all exploitation. And so we can only advise our class comrades not to vote. Or if they reject this proposal as too negative, and wish to conduct a more positive and more realistic policy,--well, of course, there is no one to prevent them from sp itting in the face of the parliamentarians.

::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::

Forthcoming Articles in the Council Correspondence

German Imperialism -- Bolshevism in Spain ? -- The Power of the Classes -- Claqs Struggle in War -- The Council Movement in England -- The Captializing of Asia Dictatorship of the Intellectuals -- Marx and Lenin on the State -- Planned Economy Nonsense in the Labor Movement -- Competition and Average Rate of Profit --

----------and other interesting articles.

Solicit subscriptions for the Council Correspondence, so that we may improve and expand it.

##########

R E A D :

Rätekorrespondenz, (theoretisches - und Diskussionsorgan für die Rätebewegung.)
Herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommunisten (Holland)
Einzelnummer 10 ¢

THE MINERS' STRIKE IN BELGIUM

The strike of the Belgium miners in May 1935 must be rated as one of the most significant struggles of the past ten years. These strikers employed tactics which had not been heard of before in the history of Belgian labor. For the first time large masses of workers refused to accept the leadership of trade unions as well as the advice of party politicians; instead, they insisted on conducting the strike themselves and allowed only members from their own ranks to represent them at the arbitration boards. For the first time, thus, the workers acted unitedly as a class in contradistinction to party and trade union policies which sought to separate them into trades, crafts, etc., a policy-as we have repeatedly pointed out--that is utterly wrong in face of the objective conditions. The birth of the self-initiative of these workers is all the more astounding because there existed no group which propagated these principles.

What factors were instrumental in turning the workers against their unions and towards new methods?

The Situation Before the Strike.

The "black country"--as the mining district in South Belgium is called--is poverty stricken. Unemployment is rampant. Since 1925 many mines have been closed and of the 38,000 miners formerly employed, only 20,000 worked at the time of the strike, and many of these were employed but part of the time. In other districts farther North, conditions are somewhat better; nowhere, however, does a miner work five days per week, and the wages are very low. These wages are not stationary; they fall or rise in accordance with the change of market prices for consumers' goods. This "genuine" method is called the "flexible wage scale", and as wages are usually behind prices, it is estimated that the loss on the workers' side amounts to approximately 30%. The standard of living is so low that in most cases miners are compelled to live on a piece of bread during their eight hours of hard and dangerous labor. The mines are in horrible condition; many have faulty or no safety devices at all, and the number of casualties is extremely high.

The trade unions and the Socialist Party found in the miners their strongest supporters. The Stalinites had and still have little influence. As the economic crisis deepened, the workers called for action and demanded the general strike, but the leadership declared that strikes at that time would mean suicide to the organization. Sporadic

strikes, however, broke out in many districts and in 1932 they gained such momentum that the union leaders were compelled to support the movement.

During and after these strikes, the Trotzkyites gained great influence because of their persistent fight against the union bureaucracy, and although the miners remained members of the unions, the ideological influence of the Trotzkyites was widely felt. Dissatisfaction with the trade union leadership grew and found expression in many demonstrations and demands for action. The leaders balked and, during the cabinet-crisis, went to the king, told him of the plight of the masses and persuaded him to form a catholic-socialist cabinet. Five former socialists entered the government as secretaries of state among whom were Delattre president of the miners' union, and Spaak, a former archenemy of the reformists. The masses who had great confidence in the latter soon realized his treacherous role and "relieved" him of his job as editor of "Socialist Action". With ever increasing force, it dawned upon the miners that they could hope for nothing from their leaders and that they would have to rely upon their own power to circumvent further pauperization.

The Strike.

On May 1, 1935 thousands of workers followed the call of the socialist parties and the trade unions to celebrate May-Day. The huge street demonstrations were peaceful and no sign of unrest was noticeable. But trouble began the following morning at the mine "Pont de Loup". Angered by the discovery that several hundred miners had not observed May-Day, the May-Day celebrators demanded the dismissal of the strike breakers. The mining company refused to comply with the demand. Thereupon 600 miners went out on strike, issuing a strike call which included the following points:

1. Occupation of the pit-heads
2. Spreading of the strike to other mines
3. The strike to be led by the strikers themselves, interference by trade unions and political parties not to be tolerated
4. Dismissal of the strike breakers
5. 10% wage increase
6. The trade unions to be informed of these demands

Twenty-four hours later the company yielded; the strike was over.

The news of this speedy success spread rapidly from mine to mine. Everywhere it was talked about; everywhere the miners felt that they too could do what the boys from the "Pont de Loup" had done. About a week later the great strike broke out. Food prices had been increased by 10% while the wages

remained constant. The bitterness of the workers reached its height when it became known that the socialist Minister Dellattre, had cancelled the additional pay for the care of children which previously had been granted by the conservative government of Theunis. The day after the publication of this new decree, 500 workers of the St. Barbara mine struck. Following the "Pont de Loup" example, they remained on the property of the company. The company refused to negotiate and advised the strikers to leave the property before midnight or they would call in the militia. The majority of the strikers disregarded the warning. At 12 o'clock lights were suddenly turned off and the militia attacked the unarmed workers. The battle raged until dawn before the miners yielded to the superior military force. Wholesale arrests followed. The strike seemed to be crushed, but on the following day 10,000 miners at Hennegau and Charleroi walked out in protest against the butchery at St. Barbara--a small number, however, if one remembers that there are approximately 30,000 miners in these districts. Yet the significance lies in the fact that the strike broke out spontaneously and that the strikers refused to be led by the official trade union leaders. The ruling class and its lackeys were very much disturbed by the development of the strike. There were at first not more than 15 to 20% of the total workers on strike, and the government organs in collaboration with the trade unions labored feverishly to discredit it and bring it under control. They knew that a leaderless mass movement might attempt to crush the 'sacred institutions of the capitalist state. A former member of the German Reichstag, Delbrueck, once said of the great election victory of the Social Democrats: "Such a victory could become dangerous if there were no leaders, but with leaders one can negotiate; they are humans like we are and they too cook their soup with water".

However, these masses had no leaders. The workers had consummated a real united front in their own ranks. They refused to be misled by parties and trade unions, and they ignored the usual procedure of trade unionism with each of the craft unions determining independently its own attitude In the past, the unorganized mass had not been called upon at all, and yet very often this same mass represents the factor that may determine success or failure of a strike.

In this strike, the workers succeeded in overcoming their organizational disunity. They composed their resolutions jointly, ignoring the specific organizational attachment of the various individuals. Class unity superseded organizational discipline.

For the strikers this movement was essentially a wage struggle. They were searching for new forms in their struggle only because the old way of the unions had failed. And these new forms were found in two measures:organizationally

in the self-acting fighting-committees (workers' councils) whose actions were independent of all parties and unions, and, in action, thru the occupation of various mines. Of the 15 mines that were on strike on Thursday, May 16, six were occupied by the workers. Their unity was expressed in the common direction. Together they fought and together they were determined to conclude the issue. The mines were occupied in order to prevent the continuation of work by strike breakers, and also because it was essential to preserve a united front which would disappear if individual strikers would go home and lose close touch with the mass. The feeling of solidarity is much greater when all are continuously together. The occupation would also serve as a weapon against the mine owners as it was expected that troops would be called in. It was planned to damage the equipment if the workers would be attacked by the militia. This was carried out later but only to a small extent. Although the workers had a picket at the dynamite magazine--whose contents might be used for damaging certain shafts--nothing was done in this respect.

When a mine was occupied, the gates were closed and a workers' defense committee was formed. Pickets were placed at the gates day and night permitting no one to enter. The emergency work was carried out by the strikers themselves. The horses were regularly fed and the pumps continued to work to remove the water. The movement thus assumed a character entirely devoid of force. It was decided to take forcible action only when the troops applied force.

The Trade Unions Choke the Strike.

The administrative authorities as well as the trade unions tried in every possible way to crush the strike movement. The Miners' Federation demanded that its members resume work, thus becoming a strike breaking organization.

The main council of the miners' union issued a proclamation to the miners in which it warned of communist agitators who put difficulties in the way of the five socialist secretaries of state that were making an effort to ameliorate the conditions of the working class. The proclamation declared that strikes at that time were justified only in exceptional cases, and then only if arbitration failed to resolve the difficulties. From the beginning, the miners' union opposed the sporadic strikes and pointed out in a manifesto that these strikes were "a breach of promise" and in opposition to the tactics pursued by the modern labor movement.

These tactics, to settle the conflict, met with no success. The only result (which was important to the ruling class and its servants, the trade unions) was that the great mass of miners did not yet participate in the strike. The

bureaucracy of the trade unions now tried to employ different methods to break the strike, which, evidently, proved more successful. As was known, the demands of the miners were not identical in all cases. In one place minimum wages were the only demand, in another an increase in wages, and still in others the maintenance of the additional pay for children. The last mentioned demand and that for a minimum wage of 30 fr. a day was almost general, while in addition in some mines an increase in wages of 5%, in others of 10% was demanded.

These varying demands were used very cleverly by the trade unions to settle the conflicts in various individual mines. In the Marchienne au Pont Mine the miners' leaders obtained the promise of the Mine Administration that the lowest wages would be improved. The strikers were satisfied with this settlement and decided to resume work on Friday. In the Dampreny Mine the conflicts were settled in the same way. In the industrial center of Charleroi another way was tried, in addition to the above mentioned methods, to break the strike. The miners' union called for a congress on the 19th of May of the coal center of Charleroi only. It was ascertained that around Charleroi eight local strikes with 3,000 men involved were effective. The delegates defended the occupation of the mines and declared that this had not been influenced by communistic activities, but that "the miners were forced by misery to do so". Finally a resolution was passed which:

1. disapproved of the occupation of the mines by the miners

2. urged the miners to accept the old existing wage agreements

3. and stated that the national, mixed mine commission would be requested to arrange a meeting to discuss improving wages which are below 30 fr. a day

This resolution was accepted with a small majority; 17 locals were for it, 14 against it, and 5 abstained from voting. Various locals were not represented. It is important to note that the union employed here the "democracy" of a board of arbitration as a weapon against the strikers.

The State Participates.

The unions were not the only participants in stifling the strike movement. They had strong allies in the state authorities. What better purpose could the five socialist Ministers perform who had the armed force at their disposal? Monday, May 19th, it became known that 500 soldiers were on their way to the industrial center of Charleroi,

and this naturally aroused the deep anger of the miners. The strikers went to the mines and occupied a few more shafts. On Tuesday, May 20th, the news spread that the troops had actually arrived. When this became known, many hurried to the mines, and especially the women encouraged the men to hold out. The strikers allowed no one to enter the mines, not even the socialist and communist leaders.

The militia settled the struggle in their well-known way. Without losing time, they marched to the mines, encircled them and attacked the workers with tear gas, driving them out of the shafts. Fifteen men at Pont de Loup were unwilling to surrender. They climbed 200 meters down thru an air shaft to start a hunger strike. After being threatened that they would be gassed also, they were forced to give up. Within a short time the shafts were cleared and all mines were occupied by soldiers. However, this interference by the police did not end the conflict. The miners answered with an extension of the strike. The following day, Wednesday, work was laid down in 28 mines involving 13,000 workers. On Thursday, May 23, the strike movement spread further into the center of Charleroi and vicinity. Thirty-two of 59 mines were now on strike, affecting 18,000 men.

The interference of the armed force had obviously caused quite the opposite result to that planned by the socialist Ministers. Instead of suppressing the movement, it had spread to 18,000 workers and the strike was growing stronger every day. Therefore, another attempt by the socialist government was made to reach the goal by means of "democracy". "Reasons have apparently no influence on the miners", said the central organ of the Dutch Social Democracy, on May 23. "The advices of the union leaders are disregarded. The latter hope to reach an agreement at the meeting of the national mine commission". Since the five socialist Ministers, the union leaders and the armed forces were unable to choke the strike and thus submit the workers anew to the exploitation of capitalism, they resorted, as a last measure, to "democracy". The speculation on the influence which the workers supposedly have on the mine commission had the desired effect!

In the Mine Commission a compromise was reached with the promise that the lowest wages were to be improved. Furthermore, there should be a general increase in wages of 5% because the index of the food prices had been raised that much. As a "concession" of the coal barons, an immediate payment of 2-1/2 % wage increase was obtained which, however, was to be deducted later from the 5% wage increase taking place on June 1. Finally, the socialist government announced thru Delattre that the decree about the deduction of the additional pay for children would be subject to a later revision.

The miners subsequently returned to their pits. "The strikers appear to have regained their senses", wrote the Social Democratic Press. "They listen again to the union leaders who appear in their meetings".

Local Charleroi of the miners' union resolved by 57% to accept the agreement, and the centrum was also satisfied. The five Socialist Ministers and the trade unions had attained their aim - the stifling of the strike .

Conclusion.

This struggle disclosed to the Belgian miners the role that trade unions and social democracy play in the present period. It becomes more and more evident to the workers that social democracy and trade unions in case of a conflict between workers and the owning class take the side of capitalism, and that they will employ all methods in order to suppress a strike. At the same time this strike revealed the pronounced class antagonism. In order to avoid only a deduction in the additional pay for children and to assure themselves of as low a wage as 30 francs a day - meaning 120-150 fr. in a general working week of 4-5 days -, in other words, just for the bare existence, the workers were forced to wage a fight against the State and five socialist Ministers with their armed forces and, in addition, even against their own trade unions.

The miners' strike of May 1935 is over, but the movement has not yet reached its end. 1935 was only the continuation of the strike movement in 1932 with subsequent smaller strikes. The reasons for the continued difficulties are still in existence and the situation is thus ripe for revolutionary propaganda. These workers who found thru class instinct the right way to united action will now understand that the new forms of struggle are not "accidental" but will be at the center of the coming class movements. The propaganda that is now required must emphasize the necessity for industrial unity and the importance of self-leadership on the part of the workers. Methods to be used in the struggle must be decided by the workers themselves and not be outside agencies which only lead labor in the interest of capitalism.

# # # # # # # # # # # # #

P A M P H L E T S :

World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution	10 ¢
Bolshevism or Communism	5 ¢
What Next for the American Workers ?	10 ¢
The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism	10 ¢
Marxism or Leninism;by Rosa Luxemburg	10 ¢

BOOM WITH TWELVE MILLION UNEMPLOYED

The year 1935 witnessed a notable upswing of industrial production in a number of countries, and particularly in the United States. With the beginning of 1936, a downward movement again set in which in the U.S.A. lowered production by 10 to 15 percent and brought the number of unemployed to over 12 millions. The business optimism created by the upswing of 1935 is again on the decline.

As compared with the month of October 1934, the output of means of production in the U.S.A. for the same month of 1935 had increased by 92 percent, tho in the consumption-goods industries the increase amounted to only 7 percent. This increase in producers' goods is attributable to the replacement of fixed capital--a matter which had become necessary but to which no attention was given in the long years of crisis--and is likewise evidence of the intensified technical rationalization of the enterprises, as indicated by the fact that the number of unemployed and the production have increased simultaneously. There was no expansion of fixed capital, no important new investments. And since the beginning of 1936, the number of orders of machinery for the existing enterprises has again declined. The continuance of capital accumulation is accordingly out of the picture.

The rise in production was accompanied by an improvement in the way of profits. What M.C.Taylor has had to say on this point with reference to the situation in the United States Steel Corporation holds also for a number of other capitalist enterprises: "In the light of the depressed conditions which prevailed during the four years prior to 1935, in which profits fell short of an amount sufficient to cover full depreciation provisions and other general charges, the improved results should be found more encouraging. They demonstrate in no small way the effectiveness of intensive administration and economies successfully instituted thru the united efforts of the entire staff in an endeavor to bring about profitable results." Even tho the profits have risen, still the absence of new investments shows that a profitable basis for the further progressive accumulation is not present. And so the light boom of 1935 is doomed to be nipped in the bud. The promising and much cited rise in the value of stocks, though bound up with the increase of profits, is after all founded more upon the speculative hope of future earnings, for which, however, no basis exists. Optimism on this point can hardly be very great even in capitalist circles, in view of their impassioned attacks upon Roosevelt's projected taxing program. Col. Leonard B. Ayres emphasizes that the proposed tax measures "must operate to reduce

dividends". The burden to be imposed upon industry by the proposed corporation tax is too slight, however, to serve as an alibi for the failure of a new boom to make its appearance or to justify its failure to keep on growing. The only success so far attending the endeavors to reestablish profitability has merely been a reduction of the losses. Capital was no longer compelled to live on the reserves which it had heaped up in the years of prosperity. The losses which had to be covered from these reserves amounted in 1932 to approximately 8.8 billion dollars, according to the Department of Commerce; in 1934 to only 1.6 billions and in 1935 there were even slight surpluses. The fact that the proposed tax measures are expected to lead to a stripping of the reserves is an indication that no one is expecting much from the future. The next thing in order is a continuation of the technical rationalization and of the concentration of capitals, mergers such as that of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, etc., against all protests of the small stockholders, and without any improvement whatever in the general condition of society. There will be a growth in the number of unemployed, and the general impoverishment will become greater. "Booms" in the permanent crisis accelerate the decay.

- - - -

the left-republican bourgeoisie; the power is in the hands of people who are unwilling to use it in favor of the workers, and so are compelled to employ it against them. Azana and his cabinet represent the interests of bourgeois society and are enemies of the proletariat. They have made a few unessential concessions to the workers, such as the liberation of political prisoners (who, of course, can be arrested again tomorrow,) in order to calm the masses temporarily until the state power is sufficiently reconsolidated to prevent any real change of the workers' situation. In this connection they are being supported by all shades of socialists and communists. Workers are still being fed with bullets, and are called upon to observe law and order.

The"victory" in Spain is a victory of the labor fakers.The confidence still reposed in these persons by great masses of the workers will be dearly paid for. Nor will the poverty of the farming population be relieved, as this government is incapable of any essential reforms. But even the breaking up of the large estates, which is not at all likely, would leave the workers' situation unchanged, except for increasing the number of their enemies. It is quite impossible as yet to speak of a victory of the workers in Spain. A change of government can mean nothing to them, and that is the most that has yet come about. If the workers were actually to go farther, if they should begin to take up seriously with the socio-economic overturn, they would have to recognize forthwith that their present "friends" are their enemies. The people's-front government is resolved to club them down just as any fascist dictatorship would do, if they should venture to over-step the bounds of the exploitation economy. The struggle of the spanish workers on their own account has yet to begin; they are still fighting for others and for illusions. They will have to recognize their present "friends" as more dangerous than their enemies of yesterday. The scurvy rabble of the Communist Party "will support Azana's government in the measure in which it holds to its obligations and carries out the program of the People's Front", as we read in the Hundschau of February 27, 1936. Claridad, the social-democratic organ of Largo Caballero, writes: "We shall be on the side of the government to carry out with all necessary firmness the common program". What can really be the program of professional gummen of capitalism a la Azana? Or what can be expected from such professional labor traitors as Caballero? So long as these people make politics in Spain,it is nonsense to speak of a victory there of the workers.

The People's Block of today will leave capitalist society intact, But sooner or later new uprisings will occur in spite of the Block, for the present government has neither the will nor the power to effect essential economic changes. Apart from the spontaneous factor at work in conditions

of impoverishment and which leads to the creation of mass movements, it is also improbable that the spanish Syndicalists will continue to leave the field of the labor movement so uncontested to the competing organizations of the Communists and Socialists. The weakness and disunity of the ruling classes themselves, the impossibility of progressive capitalist development in Spain under the present conditions of the permanent world crisis, will sooner or later abolish the present pseudo-democratism in Spain and lead to a new bourgeois dictatorship, unless the working and impoverished masses of Spain take up arms and proceed against the present people's-front government, begin thruout the country with the expropriation of the owners, and exercise the power on their own account. That may come about in case the mass movements slip from the hands of the political trucksters. We may then be presented with the prospect of something more hopeful in Spain than the usual defeat which the workers endure when they restrict themselves to questions of who or what party holds the reins of government.

oooooooooooooooooooooooo

- 000000000000000 -

oooooooooooooooooooooooo

Marx on Social Reform (Selected Essays;p.131)

HOWEVER partial the industrial revolt may be, it conceals within itself a universal soul:political revolt may be never so universal but it hides a narrow-minded spirit under the most colossal form. -- A social revolution may be considered from the standpoint of the whole because, even if it only occurs in a factory district,it is a protest of men against degraded life, because it proceeds from the standpoint of the real individual, because the community against whose separation from himself the individual reacts, is the real community of men, the civic community.-- The political soul of a revolution,on the other hand, consists in the endeavour of the classes without political influence to abolish their isolation from the community and from government.Their standpoint is that of the State,an abstract whole,which exists only in and through its separation from real life,which is unthinkable without the organized antagonism between the general idea and the individual existence of man. Consequently a revolution of political souls organizes a ruling clique in society,in accordance with the limited and doubly-cleft nature of these souls,at the cost of society.--Every revolution dissolves the old society;in so far it is social.Every revolution overthrows the old power;in so far it is political.--Without a revolution , socialism cannot be enforced.It requires this political act,so far as it has need of the process of destruction. But where its organizing activity begins,where its proper aim emerges,there socialism casts away the political hull.

W O R K E R S' C O U N C I L S.

In its revolutionary struggles, the working class needs organization. When great masses have to act as a unit, a mechanism is needed for understanding and discussion, for the making and issuing of decisions, and for the proclaiming of actions and aims.

This does not mean, of course, that all great actions and universal strikes are carried out with soldierlike discipline, after the decisions of a central board. Such cases will occur, it is true, but more often, thru their eager fighting spirit, their solidarity and passion, masses will break out in strikes to help their comrades, or to protest against some capitalist atrocity, with no general plan. Then such a strike will spread like a prairie fire all over the country.

In the first Russian revolution, the strike waves went up and down. Often the most successful were those that had not been decided in advance, while the strikes that had been proclaimed by the central committees often failed.

The strikers, once they are fighting, want mutual contact and understanding in order to unite in an organized force. Here a difficulty presents itself. Without strong organization, without joining forces and binding their will in one solid body, without uniting their action in one common deed, they cannot win against the strong organization of capitalist power. But when thousands and millions of workers are united in one body, this can only be managed by functionaries acting as representatives of the members. And we have seen that then these officials become masters of the organization, with interests different from the revolutionary interests of the workers.

How can the working class, in revolutionary fights, unite its force into a big organization without falling into the pit of officialdom? The answer is given by putting another question: if all that the workers do is to pay their fees and to obey when their leaders order them out and order them in, are they themselves then really fighting their fight for freedom?

Fighting for freedom is not letting your leaders think for you and decide, and following obediently behind them, or from time to time scolding them. Fighting for freedom is partaking to the full of one's capacity, thinking and deciding for oneself, taking all the responsibilities as a self-relying individual amidst equal comrades. It is true that to think for oneself, to think out what is true and right, with a head dulled by fatique, is the hardest, the most difficult task; it is much harder than to pay and to obey. But it is the only way to freedom. To be liberated by others, whose leadership is the essential part of the liberation, means the getting of new masters instead of the old ones.

Freedom, the goal of the workers, means that they shall be able, man for man, to manage the world, to use and deal with the treasures of the earth, so as to make it a happy home for all. How can they ensure this if they are not able to conquer and defend this themselves?

The proletarian revolution is not simply the vanquishing of capitalist power, It is the rise of the whole working people out of dependence and ignorance into independence and clear consciousness of how to make their life.

True organization, as the workers need it in the revolution, implies that everyone takes part in it, body and soul and brains; that everyone takes part in leadership as well as in action, and has to think out, to decide and to perform to the full of his capacities. Such an organization is a body of self-determining people. There is no place for professional leaders. Certainly there is obeying; everybody has to follow the decisions which he himself has taken part in making. But the full power always rests with the workers themselves.

Can such a form of organization be realized? What must be its structure? It is not necessary to construct it or think it out. History has already produced it. It sprang into life out of the practice of the class struggle. Its prototype, its first trace, is found in the strike committees. In a big strike, all the workers cannot assemble in one meeting. They choose delegates to act as a committee. Such a committee is only the executive organ of the strikers; it is continually in touch with them and has to carry out the decisions of the strikers. Each delegate at every moment can be replaced by others; such a committee never becomes an independent power. In such a way, common action as one body can be secured, and yet the workers have all decisions in their own hands. Usually in strikes, the uppermost lead is taken out of the hands of these committees by the trade unions and their leaders.

In the Russian revolution when strikes broke out irregularly in the factories, the strikers chose delegates which, for the whole town or for an industry or railway over the whole state or province, assembled to bring unity into the fight. They had at once to discuss political matters and to assume political functions because the strikes were directed against Czarism. They were called soviets; councils. In these soviets all the details of the situation, all the workers' interests, all political events were discussed. The delegates went to and fro continually between the assembly and their factories. In the factories and shops the workers, in general meetings, discussed the same matters, took their decisions and often sent new delegates. Able socialists were appointed as secretaries, to give advice based on their wider knowledge. Often these soviets had to act as political powers, as a kind of

primitive government when the Czarist power was paralyzed, when officials and officers did not know what to do and left the field to them. Thus these soviets became the permanent center of the revolution; they were constituted by delegates of all the factories, striking or working. They could not think of becoming an independent power. The members were often changed and sometimes the whole soviet was arrested and had to be replaced by new delegates. Moreover they knew that all their force was rooted in the workers' will to strike or not to strike; often their calls were not followed when they did not concur with the workers' instinctive feelings of power or weakness, of passion or prudence. So the soviet-system proved to be the appropriate form of organization for a revolutionary working class. In 1917 it was at once adopted in Russia, and everywhere workers' and soldiers' soviets came into being and were the driving force of the revolution.

The complementary proof was given in Germany. In 1918, after the breakdown of the military power, workers' and soldiers' councils in imitation of Russia were founded. But the German workers, educated in party and union discipline, full of social-democratic ideas of republic and reform as the next political aims, chose their party- and union-officials as delegates into these councils. When fighting and acting themselves, they acted and fought in the right way, but from lack of selfconfidence they chose leaders filled with capitalist ideas, and these always spoilt matters. It is natural that a "council congress" then resolved to abdicate for a new parliament, to be chosen as soon as possible.

Here it became evident that the council system is the appropriate form of organization only for a revolutionary working class. If the workers do not intend to go on with the revolution, they have no use for soviets. If the workers are not far enough advanced yet to see the way of revolution, if they are satisfied with the leaders doing all the work of speechifying and mediating and bargaining for reforms within capitalism, then parliaments and party- and union-congresses, -- called workers parliaments because they work after the same principle -- are all they need. If, however, they fight with all their energy for revolution, if with intense eagerness and passion they take part in every event, if they think over and decide for themselves all details of fighting because they have to do the fighting, then workers' councils are the organization they need.

This implies that workers' councils cannot be formed by revolutionary groups. Such groups can only propagate the idea by explaining to their fellow workers the necessity of council-organization, when the working class as a self-determining power fights for freedom. Councils are the form of organization only for fighting masses, for the working class as a whole, not for revolutionary groups.

They originate and grow up along with the first action of a revolutionary character. With the development of revolution, their importance and their functions increase. At first they may appear as simple strike committees, in opposition to the labor leaders when the strikes go beyond the intentions of the leaders, and rebel against the unions and their leaders.

In a universal strike the functions of these committees are enlarged. Now delegates of all the factories and plants have to discuss and to decide about all the conditions of the fight; they will try to regulate into consciously devised actions all the fighting power of the workers; they must see how they will react upon the governments' measures, the doings of soldiers or capitalist gangs. By means of this very strike action, the actual decisions are made by the workers themselves. In the councils, the opinions, the will, the readiness, the hesitation, or the eagerness, the energy and the obstacles of all these masses concentrate and combine into a common line of action. They are the symbols, the exponents of the workers' power; but at the same time they are only the spokesmen who can be replaced at any moment. At one time they are outlaws to the capitalist world, and at the next, they have to deal as equal parties with the high functionaries of government.

When the revolution develops to such power that the State power is seriously affected, then the workers' councils have to assume political functions. In a political revolution, this is their first and chief function. They are the central bodies of the workers' power; they have to take all measures to weaken and defeat the adversary. Like a power at war, they have to stand guard over the whole country, controlling the efforts of the capitalist class to collect and restore their forces and to subdue the workers. They have to look after a number of public affairs which otherwise were state affairs: public health, public security, and the uninterrupted course of social life. They have to take care of the production itself; the most important and difficult task and concern of the working class in revolution.

A social revolution in history never began as a simple change of political rulers who then, after having acquired political power, carried out the necessary social changes by means of new laws. Already, before and during the fight, the rising class built up its new social organs as new sprouting branches within the dead husk of the former organism. In the French revolution, the new capitalist class, the citizens, the business men, the artizans, built up in each town and village their communal boards, their new courts of justice, illegal at the time, usurping simply the functions of the powerless functionaries of royalty. While their delegates in Paris discussed and made the new constitution, the actual constitution was made all over the country

by the citizens holding their political meetings, building up their political organs afterwards legalized by law.

In the same way during the proletarian revolution, the new rising class creates its new forms of organization which step by step in the process of revolution supersede the old State organization. The workers' councils, as the new form of political organization, take the place of parliamentarism, the political form of capitalist rule.

Parliamentary democracy is considered by capitalist theorists as well as by social-democrats as the perfect democracy, conform to justice and equality. In reality, it is only a disguise for capitalist domination, and contrary to justice and equality. It is the council system that is the true workers' democracy.

Parliamentary democracy is foul democracy. The people are allowed to vote once in four or five years and to choose their delegates; woe to them if they do not choose the right man. Only at the polls the voters can exert their power; thereafter they are powerless. The chosen delegates are now the rulers of the people; they make laws and constitute governments, and the people have to obey. Usually, by the election mechanism, only the big capitalist parties with their powerful apparatus, with their papers, their noisy advertising, have a chance to win. Real trustees of discontented groups seldom have a chance to win some few seats.

In the soviet system, each delegate can be repealed at any moment. Not only do the workers continually remain in touch with the delegate, discussing and deciding for themselves, but the delegate is only a temporary messenger to the council assemblies. Capitalist politicians denounce this "characterless" role of the delegate, in that he may have to speak against his personal opinion. They forget that just because there are no fixed delegates, only those will be sent whose opinions conform to those of the workers.

The principle of parliamentary representation is that the delegate in parliament shall act and vote according to his own conscience and conviction. If on some question he should ask the opinion of his voters, it is only due to his own prudence. Not the people, but he on his own responsibility has to decide. The principle of the soviet system is just the reverse; the delegates only express the opinions of the workers.

In the elections for parliament, the citizens are grouped according to voting districts and counties; that is to say according to their dwelling place. Persons of different

trades or classes, having nothing in common, accidently living near one another, are combined into an artificial group which has to be represented by one delegate.

In the councils, the workers are represented in their natural groups, according to factories, shops and plants. The workers of one factory or one big plant form a unit of production; they belong together by their collective work. In revolutionary epoohs, they are in immediate contact to interchange opinions; they live under the same conditions and have the same interests. They must act together; the factory is the unit which as a unit has to strike or to work, and its workers must decide what they collectively have to do. So the organization and delegation of workers in factories and workshops is the necessary form.

It is at the same time the principle of representation of the communist order growing up in the revolution. Production is the basis of society, or, more rightly, it is the contents, the essence of society; hence the order of production is at the same time the order of society. Factories are the working units, the cells of which the organism of society consists. The main task of the political organs, which mean nothing else but the organs managing the totality of society, concerns the productive work of society. Hence it goes without saying that the working people, in their councils, discuss these matters and choose their delegates, collected in their production-units.

We should not believe, though, that parliamentarism, as the political form of capitalism, was not founded on production Always the political organization is adapted to the character of production as the basis of society. Representation, according to dwelling place, belongs to the system of petty capitalist production, where each man is supposed to be the possessor of his own small business. Then there is a mutual connection between all these businessmen at one place, dealing with one another, living as neighbors, knowing one another and therefore sending one common delegate to parliament. This was the basis of parliamentarism. We have seen that later on this parliamentary delegation-system proved to be the right system for representing the growing and changing class interests within capitalism.

At the same time it is clear now why the delegates in parliament had to take political power in their hands. Their political task was only a small part of the task of society. The most important part, the productive work, was the personal task of all the separate producers, the citizens as business men; it required nearly all their energy and care. When every individual took care of his own small lot, then society as their totality went right. The general regulations by law, necessary conditions, doubtlessly, but of minor extent, could

be left to the care of a special group or trade, the politicians. With communist production the reverse is true. Here the all important thing, the collective productive work, is the task of society as a whole; it concerns all the workers collectively. Their personal work does not claim their whole energy and care; their mind is turned to the collective task of society. The general regulation of this collective work cannot be left to a special group of persons; it is the vital interest of the whole working people.

There is another difference between parliamentarism and the soviet system. In parliamentary democracy, one vote is given to every adult man and sometimes woman on the strength of their supreme, inborn right of belonging to mankind, as is so beautifully expressed in celebration speeches. In the soviets, on the other hand, only the workers are represented. Can the council system then be said to be truly democratic if it excludes the other classes of society?

The council system embodies the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx and Engels, more than half a century ago, explained that the social revolution was to lead to the dictatorship of the working class as the next political form and that this was essential in order to bring about the necessary changes in society. Socialists, thinking in terms of parliamentary representation only, tried to excuse or to criticize the violation of democracy and the injustice of arbitrarily excluding persons from the polls because they belong to certain classes. Now we see how the development of the proletarian class struggle in a natural way produces the organs of this dictatorship, the soviets.

It is certainly no violation of justice that the councils, as the fighting centers of a revolutionary working class, do not include representatives of the opposing class. And thereafter the matter is not different. In a rising communist society there is no place for capitalists; they have to disappear and they will disappear. Whoever takes part in the collective work is a member of the collectivity and takes part in the decisions. Persons, however, who stand outside the process of collective production, are, by the structure of the council system, automatically excluded from influence upon it. Whatever remains of the former exploiters and robbers has no vote in the regulation of a production in which they take no part.

There are other classes in society that do not directly belong to the two chief opposite classes: small farmers, independent artizans, intellectuals. In the revolutionary fight they may waver to and fro, but on the whole they are not very important, because they have less fighting power. Mostly their forms of organization and their aims are

different. To make friends with them or to neutralize them, if this is possible without impeding the proper aims or to fight them resolutely if necessary, to decide upon the way of dealing with them with equity and firmness,will be the concern,often a matter of difficult tactics, of the fighting working class. In the production-system, insofar as their work is useful and necessary, they will find their place and they will exert their influence after the principle that whoever does the work has a chief vote in regulating the work.

More than half a century ago, Engels said that thru the proletarian revolution the State would disappear; instead of the ruling over men would come the managing of affairs. This was said at a time when there could not be any clear idea about how the working class would come into power. Now we see the truth of this statement confirmed. In the process of revolution, the old State Power will be destroyed, and the organs that take its place, the workers' councils, for the time being, will certainly have important political functions still to repress the remnants of capitalist power. Their political function of governing,however, will be gradually turned into nothing but the economic function of managing the collective process of production of goods for the needs of society.

- J. H. -

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION of the nineteenth century can not draw its poetry from the past, it can draw that only from the future.It cannot start upon its work before it has stricken off all superstition concerning the past.Former revolutions required historic reminiscences in order to intoxicate themselves with their own issues.The revolution of the nineteenth century must let the dead bury their dead in order to reach its issue.With the former, the phrase surpasses the substance; with this one, the substance surpasses the phrase.
---Proletarian revolutions criticise themselves constantly; constantly interrupt themselves in their own course; come back to what seems to have been accomplished, in order to start over anew; scorn with cruel thoroughness the half measures, weaknesses and meannesses of their first attempts; seem to throw down their adversary only in order to enable him to draw fresh strength from the earth, and again to rise up against them in more gigantic stature;constantly recoil in fear before the undefined monster magnitude of their own objects --until finally that situation is created which renders all retreat impossible,and the conditions themselves cry out:" Hic Rhodus,hic salta!"
Marx; The Eighteenth Brumaire; p.14.

B O O K _ R E V I E W S

Conze, Edward. - The Scientific Method of Thinking.
An Introduction to Dialectical Materialism.
Chapman & Hall, Ltd., London.1935 (168pp.,5S)

Conze's elementary introduction to dialectical materialism is well designed to meet a long-felt need in the labor movement for a popular and yet scientific presentation of the marxian method of thinking. Even if his book does not offer much that is new theoretically, except in the choice of the examples, still it is of great value for the education of workers, especially because of its exemplarily clear and simple language.

After emphasizing the necessity of scientific method for the control of nature and society, Conze explains the main postulates of the materialist dialectic: the necessity of concrete thinking, regard for the unity of opposites, the viewing of all things as in process of motion, and the recognition of the contradictions by which all motion is determined. Conze's interpretation of these propositions is based on expositions from the contemporary political and economic scene and is fully adapted to the general understanding. Special attention is here devoted to the contested leader-mass problem, and Conze represents the view that however low the degree of consciousness involved, the mass is after all capable of safe-guarding its interests. The acceptance of this assumption would make it easier to understand the historical development.

By way of illustrating the proposition of contradiction, Conze selects oppositions like that between capitalist production and social consumption, though without making plain that this contradiction is in need of further clarification by means of the one between accumulation and the need for profit. Conze also refers to the contradiction affecting the labor movement, that between reformism and socialism; his view is that mass organizations are of necessity reformist, and socialist organizations of necessity sectarian. At the same time, however, Conze considers collectively revolutionary actions as possible only in case they are theoretically grasped in advance. In this way, his exposition itself becomes involved in contradictions; for, on the one hand, it ascribes to the masses a correct mode of action in spite of inadequate theoretical recognition, and on the other it denies the possibility of success to any action which is not theoretically grasped. Even though Conze, more than other authors, may attribute great importance to the mass, still after all he holds fast to that position which makes the historical movement dependent on the development of the socialist ideology. On this basis, in considering the unity of opposites and in illustrating

the statement that no truth is without error, and no error without truth, he then arrives at the untenable position that the labor movement had to learn from Fascism, just as Fascism was able to win only because it learned from the labor movement. The competitive struggle within capitalism for mastery over the workers is here confused with the struggle for the setting aside of the present mode of production, a struggle which presupposes the self-emancipation of the workers. In other words, contradictions within capitalism are mixed up with the contradiction between Capital and Labor. The work accordingly suffers from weaknesses and inconsistencies.

Conze's frequently literal carrying over of dialectical postulates onto the various problems culminates in the assertion that "scientific thought knows no certainty, but only varying degrees of probability. To be cocksure is to be unscientific". This statement is at the same time its own devaluation, for, assuming that Conze's thought is "scientific", one cannot be "certain" either that "scientific thought knows no certainty". But the limits which Conze set for himself do not permit a more exhaustive critical consideration of his position either on the question of prediction or on the other phases of his book. As what it proposes to be, however, it deserves most extensive attention.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Uphoff, Walter, H. - The Kohler Strike. Its Socio-Economic Causes and Effects. - Chas.H.Kerr & Co. Chicago, 1935. (139 pp., $1.50)

Mr. Uphoff's study is concerned with the strike that took place in the Kohler & Kohler firm of Wisconsin in 1934, when it created something of a sensation. This company, engaged in the manufacture of heating systems, bath tubs, earthenware, etc., and employing a few thousand workers, became noted for its allegedly exemplary social policy. By way of life insurance, reduction of working hours, organization of leisure time, and especially thru its support of housing cooperatives, Kohler & Kohler acquired the reputation of being a model of a healthy relation between employers and workmen. The crisis and the long-drawn-out depression made it necessary for the company to cut wages, to introduce rationalization, to turn off workers, and transformed the advantages accruing to the workers from the housing policy into a burden. The NRA and the well-known "Section 7A" led in the Kohler shops, as elsewhere, to the building of a union. Kohler thought to destroy this union by forming a company union. A strike set in for recognition of the union's right to negotiate regarding rates of pay, and for wage demands. It soon destroyed the "Kohler legend". Kohler combatted the workers in the most brutal manner, with ex-

tortion, bribery, terror, death. The causes, development and end of the strike, the role of the neutral legal agencies, the attitude of the workers, are pointed out by Uphoff in all essential details, supported by documentary evidence and illuminated from the most varied points of view. His study is a valuable contribution for purposes of social research.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Council Correspondence recommends:

THE INEVITABILITY OF COMMUNISM
A critique of Sidney Hook's Interpretation of Marx 25 ¢

F.ENGELS : Principles of Communism 15 ¢
A.M.Simons : Class Struggles in America 10 ¢
MARX : Wage - Labor and Capital 10 ¢

Karl Marx, a Biography. By Franz Mehring $ 5.00
The Decline of American Capitalism. By L.Corey $ 4.00
ANTI-DUEHRING
Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science.
By Friedrich Engels $ 3.00
CAPITAL
Vol. I. The Process of Capitalist Production
Vol. II. The Process of Capitalist Circulation
Vol.III. The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole.
By KARL MARX 3 Vol.,$ 3.50 each.

Marx:The Eighteenth Brumaire. 60 ¢
Anton Pannekoek:Marxism and Darwinism 10 ¢
K.Marx: The Poverty of Philosophy $ 1.25
K.Marx:The Critique of the Gotha Program 50 ¢
SELECTED ESSAYS; by Karl Marx
A Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right
On the Jewish Question
On the King of Prussia and Social Reform, etc. $ 2.00

Two new pamphlets soon to be out:
THE WORKERS' WAY TO FREEDOM 15 ¢
Outline of Production & Distribution in Communism 10 ¢

Order Books and Pamphlets from :
Council Correspondence, 1604 N.California Ave.
Chicago, Ill.

####################

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Power of the Classes

Class Struggle in War

Second World War Inevitable

The Ideological Preparation for the War

National Independence and Leninism

Prevention of the War

Communism and Religion

Vol. II **No. 6**

MAY 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

tortion, bribery, terror, death. The causes, development and end of the strike, the role of the neutral legal agencies, the attitude of the workers, are pointed out by Uphoff in all essential details, supported by documentary evidence and illuminated from the most varied points of view. His study is a valuable contribution for purposes of social research.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Council Correspondence recommends:

THE INEVITABILITY OF COMMUNISM
A critique of Sidney Hook's Interpretation of Marx
25 ¢

F.ENGELS : Principles of Communism 15 ¢
A.M.Simons : Class Struggles in America 10 ¢
MARX : Wage - Labor and Capital 10 ¢

Karl Marx, a Biography. By Franz Mehring $ 5.00
The Decline of American Capitalism. By L.Corey $ 4.00
ANTI-DUEHRING
Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science.
By Friedrich Engels $ 3.00
CAPITAL
Vol. I. The Process of Capitalist Production
Vol. II. The Process of Capitalist Circulation
Vol.III. The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole.
By KARL MARX 3 Vol., $ 2.50 each.

Marx: The Eighteenth Brumaire. 60 ¢
Anton Pannekoek: Marxism and Darwinism 10 ¢
K.Marx: The Poverty of Philosophy $ 1.25
K.Marx: The Critique of the Gotha Program 50 ¢
SELECTED ESSAYS; by Karl Marx
A Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right
On the Jewish Question
On the King of Prussia and Social Reform, etc. $ 2.00

Two new pamphlets soon to be out:
THE WORKERS' WAY TO FREEDOM 15 ¢
Outline of Production & Distribution in Communism
10 ¢

Order Books and Pamphlets from :
Council Correspondence, 1604 N.California Ave.
Chicago, Ill.

####################

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Power of the Classes

Class Struggle in War

Second World War Inevitable

The Ideological Preparation for the War

National Independence and Leninism

Prevention of the War

Communism and Religion

Vol. II **No. 6**

MAY 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

.·. Published at 1604 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois .·.

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

THE POWER OF THE CLASSES.

I.

The power of the capitalist class is enormous. Never in history was there a ruling class with such power. Their power is first, money power. All the treasures of the world are theirs, and modern capital, produced by the ceaseless toil of millions of workers, exceeds all the treasures of the old world. The surplus value is partly accumulated into ever more and new capital; partly it must be spent by the capitalists. They buy servants for their personal attendants; they also buy people to defend them, to safeguard their power and their dominating position. In capitalism everything can be bought for money; muscles and brain as well as love and honor have become market goods. Said old John D. Rockefeller: "Everyone can be bought if you only know his price". The statement is not exactly true, but it shows the capitalist's view of the world.

The capitalists buy young proletarians to form a fighting force. In the same way as they buy Pinkertons against strikers, they will, in times of greater danger, organize huge armies of volunteers provided with the best modern arms, well-fed and well-paid, to defend their sacred capitalist order.

But capitalism cannot be defended by brutal force alone. Being itself the outcome of a high development of intellectual forces, it must consequently be de-

fended by these same intellectual forces. Behind the physical struggle in the class war, stands the spiritual contest of ideas. Capitalists know that,often better than the workers. Hence they buy all the good brains they can. Often in a coarse,open way; most often however, indifectly. This is done, for instance, by donating money for cultural purposes. Numerous students of science the world over have profited in their researches from the "Rockefeller Foundation".Thus the name 'Rockefeller' has a reputation in the field of natural sciences where 'Ludlow' is never heard of.This kind of philanthropy serves capitalism well. Capitalists have founded universities all over the United States where among other sciences sociology is taught, to demonstrate the impossibility and wickedness of communism. The young people leave the universities imbued with these ideas and they know high salaries and public honor await them if they do not deviate from the straight path of capitalism.

The capitalists buy the press; they buy the editors; they buy all the means of publicity, and in this way they mould public opinion. It is an invisible spiritual despotism by which the entire nation is made to think as the capitalist class wish it to think. Money reigns over the world, thus it can buy the brain power available.

Capitalist power in the second place is political.The State is the organization of the capitalist class.Its task is to render possible private production, and to enable the individual capitalists to carry on their businesses by protecting and regulating their intercourse.

The government makes laws for the protection of "honest" businessmen against "thieves" and "murderers". Against strikers and revolutionists, who are far more dangerous to the existing social order, laws even more drastic are made. For the enforcing of these laws, the police and jail are used. In every strike, in every political demonstration, the workers find the police arrayed against them, clubbing and throwing them into jail for the benefit of the capitalist class and to protect the capitalists profits. Gangs of hired thugs are sworn in as deputy sheriffs and given police authority; and when the workers cannot be subdued in this way, militia and citizen guards are mobilized against them.

In each capitalist country the army is the strongest force in the service of the capitalist class,because for its wars with other countries, it needs the fighting power of the whole country, all classes included.

The army is an organized body bound together by the strictest military discipline, provided with the most cruel, refined and effective means of killing and destroying. If it is used in political wars, where in the worst case the capitalist class suffers only heavy losses, is it not to be used then in case of revolution where the capitalist class is menaced with complete loss of all it possesses?

Thus the nation is the stronghold of capitalism. As a strongly organized power, nation-wide, directed by the uniform will of the central government, provided with a powerful army, it protects the capitalist class. Physical force, however, is not sufficient to subdue a people or a class. How many strong governments in history, though well-armed, have been overthrown by rebellions. Spiritual forces in most cases are decisive above mere physical power. In capitalism the rule holds good that in the long run it is more effectual to fool people than to beat them.

So capitalist power consists thirdly in its intellectual power. The ideas of a ruling class pervade the majority of the members of society. Certainly the capitalist class could not buy guards and intellectuals if these fellows did not share its ideology and sentiments. Capitalist government could not govern, even with its strong physical force, if the mass of the people were not filled with the same spirit as the government itself. How is it possible that in the mass of the people, even in the working class, this capitalist spirit prevails?

The main force is tradition and inheritance. The ideology of the capitalist class is nothing but the ideology of the former middle classes, the petty producers. The idea of private property as a natural right, the belief that everyone should build his own fortune and that free competition guarantees the best results, the maxim that everyone has only to care for himself and God will take care of the rest, the conviction that thrift and industry are the virtues which secure prosperity, and that America is the best country and should be defended against other nations, all these beliefs are inherited from the time and the class of small business. And this is the very creed big business wants the masses to believe in as eternal truths today.

The fathers or grandfathers of the proletarians of today were such small business men themselves; small farmers, settlers, craftsmen, even small capitalists, ridden down by competition. They, too, have inherited these ideas, and in their youth found them to be true. Then society changed rapidly and big industry developed,

and they became forever proletarians. Their ideas, however, could not change so rapidly and their mind clings to the old ideology.

Still, the school of life is powerful and impresses the mind with new ideas in line with the changing world. But now the capitalist school comes into action. With all available means, the capitalist ideas are propagated and artifically forced upon the minds of the people. At first in the schools when the children's minds are flexible and impressionable; afterwards for the adults from the pulpit, in the daily press, by the radio, the movies, etc. Their task is not only to keep the capitalistic way of thinking alive in the working class minds, but still more, to prevent them thinking at all. By filling their time and their minds with exciting futilities, they kill every wish for serious reading and thinking.

May this be called fooling the workers? The capitalistic class is sincere in this propaganda; it believes what it tries to urge upon the workers. But capitalistic ideology is foolishness for the workers. The workers have to foster the new ideas that are growing out of the changing world; they have to acquire the knowledge of the evolution of labor and of the class struggle as the way to communism.

Thus the power of the capitalist class is more than their money and political power alone. The small business men, the small farmers, who believe they will succeed by personal effort--as sometimes they do--are a part of the capitalist power. Every workman who only cares for himself and not for the future of his class, every workman who only reads capitalist newspapers and finds his chief interest in boxing matches, etc., by so doing contributes to the power of the capitalist class.

In the rapid development of technical and economic forms of production, the mind of man is left behind. This mental backwardness of the working masses is the chief power of the capitalist class.

II

What power can the working class set forth against it? First, the working class is the most numerous class in society. By the growth of industry it continually increases, whereas the number of independent businessmen has relatively decreased. The available statistics show that in the United States the working class is the largest class. Only the farmers and the salaried employees follow at some distance as important classes. The capitalist class proper is insignificant in num-

bers; and the small and middle class men and petty dealers are much less numerous than the wage workers. But number is not the only thing that counts. A number of millions, dispersed in widely separated homes all over the land, cannot exert the same power as the same number of millions pressed together in the towns. The big towns are the centers of economical, cultural and political life. The millions of workers, forming the majorities in the population in these centers, assembled into big class-agglomerations, must, under these conditions exert a strong social power.

In ancient Rome the proletarians were numerous also, and strongly concentrated. Their social power, however, was nothing because they did not work. They were parasites; they lived from public moneys. With the modern proletarians, the matter is the reverse.

The second element of power for the working class is its importance in human society. It is on their work that society is founded. The capitalists might be dismissed, the petty producers and dealers might be dispensed with, without impairing the production of life necessities which mostly takes place in the big factories. But the working class cannot be dispensed with. With its essential, fundamental role only the work of the farmers can be compared.

The workers have their hand on the production apparatus. They manage it; they work it; they command it; they have direct power over it. Not legally, for legally they have to obey the capitalists, and police and soldiers may come to enforce this legal right. But actually it is theirs, for without them the living producing machinery is a dead carcass. If they refuse to work, society cannot exist. It has happened already, that a general strike has paralyzed the entire economic and social life, and thereby wrung important concessions from the unwilling ruling class. Then for a moment, like a flash of lightning, that mighty power of the proletarian class, its intimate connection with the production apparatus, was disclosed.

To be sure, if this possible power is to become a living, actual power, a weighty condition must be fulfilled. Such united action of the whole class is not possible, if it is not sustained by a strong moral force. So, as the third element of proletarian power, we find solidarity, the spirit of unity, organization. Solidarity is the bond that unites the will of all the separate individuals into one common will, thus achieving one mighty organized action.

Is it right to speak of a specifically proletarian

virtue? Does not capitalism itself practice organization and united action in its factories, in its trusts, in its armies? Here the unity is based upon command, upon fines, upon penalties. Certainly, for common interests combined action must take place in each class, but here again the true economic position manifests itself, that capitalists are competitors, and workers are comrades.

Capitalism is based upon private business, private interests. The more eagerly the capitalist pursues his personal interests, the better for his business. Hence a hard egotism is developed that submerges natural human sympathies. The workers, on the other hand, cannot win anything by egotism. So long as they face capital individually, they are powerless and miserable; only by collective action can they win better conditions. The more they pursue personal interests, the more they are beaten down. The more they develop a feeling of fellowship, of mutual aid, of self-sacrifice for their class, the better it is for their interests.

When at the dawn of civilization, private property came into being, men separated, each to work on his own lot, in order to develop productivity of labor in mutual competition. In this century-long development, from small crafts to modern industry, civilized man rose to a sturdy self-determinism, to independence, to confidence in his own powers and to a strong feeling of individualism. All his energies and faculties were awakened to the service of his fighting powers. But this was at the cost of moral losses; egotism and cruelty grew in mankind, and distrust and enmity sprang up amidst fellowmen.

Now the modern proletariat is coming up, for the first time a class without property, hence without real interests one against the other. Still endowed with the personal energies and faculties inherited from their ancestors, they are trained by the machine into the discipline of common action. And though their attempts for a better living standard are helplessly beaten down by the overwhelming power of capitalism, much good comes from these attempts. Their common interests against the capitalist class awakens in them the feelings of brotherhood.

As the working class finds strength in its moral superiority over the capitalist class, it also finds strength in its intellectual superiority. To the feeling is added the knowledge. First comes the deed, the action of solidarity, that springs spontaneously from the depth of emotion and passion. After that comes the

insight that there is an unavoidable conflict of opposing interests. It is the first form of class-consciousness. With the deepening of knowledge, the ways of action, the fighting conditions are seen more clearly; and as is the case of all science, this insight will lead future actions along the most efficient ways of getting results.

After their number, their social importance, their moral force of solidarity, this knowledge is the fourth element in proletarian power. It is the science developed chiefly by Marx and Engels which explains, first, the course of history from the growth of society in its primitive beginnings, thru feudalism and capitalism, thence to communism, basing this analysis upon the development of labor and its productivity. And second, it explains the structure of capitalist production and shows how capitalism must break down by means of its own forces, by developing and exploiting the proletarian class, by driving it into revolt thru its own collapses, and by increasing thereby the proletarians fighting powers.

This science, Marxism, is a proletarian science. The capitalist class rejects it; its scientists deny its truth. Indeed, it is impossible for the capitalist class to accept it. No class can accept a theory that proclaims its own collapse and death; for by accepting it, it could not fight with full confidence and with full force. To fight against annihilation is a primary instinct, in a class as well as in an organism.

The capitalist class cannot see beyond the horizon of capitalism. So it sees the growing concentration of capital, the growing power of big finance, the heavy crises and the impending world wars, the rising tide of the proletarian fight with its threat of revolution, it sees all these phenomena without drawing one rational conclusion from them. It sees no sense in history, though its ablest scientists investigate every detail; its sees no light in the future, uncertainty and mysticism fill its mind. But it has one determination, to fight for its supremacy.

For the workers this science enlightens their arduous course to the future. It makes clear to them their life, their work, their poverty, their relation to their employers, and to the other classes. It explains to them the reality of the world as they experience it, different indeed from the capitalist teachings. Whereas the school of life impresses their minds with new ideas in line with the new world, it is this science of society that moulds these ideas into a firm consistent knowledge. And so the workers will eventually acquire the wisdom they need in their fight for freedom.

- J.H. -

COMMUNISM AND RELIGION

I.

The fierce struggle which Bolshevism has waged and is still waging against religion in Russia is particularly well adapted to throw light on the essence of the russian revolution. The Bolsheviks are conducting this struggle in the name of Marxism, just as all the rest of their policy is put thru. They invoke in this connection the marxian dictum which stands engraved as a motto on the facade of the Moscow community center: that religion is the opium of the people. At the time when the youthful Marx wrote that, in his "Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law" (1843), his own struggle had points of similarity with the later struggle of Bolshevism in Russia. He stood, that is, as the most advanced among the Young Hegelians, foremost in the struggle for civil liberty against feudal absolutism in Prussia. The bourgeoisie was still without political power but was coming up; public life was harassed by arbitrary action of the police, intellectual life by the censorship, and the best minds were living abroad. Narrow-minded princes were using religion as justification of their right to suppress all liberty. Therefore, according to Marx's expression at the time, the criticism of earth had to begin with the criticism of heaven.

The rise of bourgeois society was always accompanied by a struggle against the Church, against certain forms of religion or against religion in general. This was quite in the nature of things, since under feudalism Church and Society formed a strictly interrelated unity. The Church fulfilled political and social function which in later centuries were taken over more and more by the State and its organs: law-giving, instruction, administration, safe-guarding of communication, promotion of technics. In particular, everything intellectual in the guidance of society was its task, in the smallest village as well as thruout the body politic; the Church ruled like a super-monarchy over the whole of Christendom, and was the most formidable exploiting power. It was natural then that during the rise of the bourgeoisie any resistance to this exploitation should assume the form of heresy (Albigenses, Hussites). And in the following centuries when this resistance assumed the proportions of a seizure of power by the bourgeoisie, it came about under the banner of a renewal of religion, as the Reformation among the Protestants, the Calvinites and Puritans.

In the class struggles of the 16th and 17th centuries the religions were what political parties were in the 19th, the living organizations of that struggle;later they fossilized into churches with dead dogmas.

When the way was being paved for the revolution in France in the 18th century, the movement was directed not merely against the nobility and monarchy,but also against the Church. Obedience to the Church was bound up with obedience to the Prince; religion was the most important means of holding the masses in subjection. A powerful opposition, socially, to the ruling power determined therefore, spiritually, a breaking away from the Church. The principal form of this latter opposition was that of a hazy personal religious sentiment, apart from all clerical doctrine, as in the case of Rousseau, tho materialistic views were even at this time to be met with in a number of thinkers. Thru the discoveries of natural science, particularly of the law of gravitation by Newton, it had become established that nature is subject to a fixed order of natural laws precluding any arbitrary interference. This provided the rising bourgeoisie with weapons of free critical thought in its struggle against the Church. There was also the fact that the peasants and bourgeoisie looked with envy upon the great neglected landed property of the Church, a domain which they themselves had liked to possess in orde to cultivate and improve it. And in the French Revolution of 1789 they did, as a matter of fact, rob the Church of those possessions. In view of the enormous state deficit, that was the only way in which state bankruptcy could be avoided: the seizure and sale of the holdings of the Church, so that they could be put to further use for agricultural and industrial purposes. Since that time, the Church has been the sworn foe of revolution. And consequently the revolutionary bourgeoisie was obliged to attack the Church more sharply than it would otherwise have been inclined to do, by way of the struggle against religion. The fact that in France, even down to the present day, rationalism and free thought are so widespread among the middle classes is in good part owing to that historical conflict.

In the 19th century, the bourgeoisie was obliged to continue this struggle, not only in France but in other countries in which it was coming up, in order to gain the complete mastery. And in this connection the struggle against the prevailing religion had to be carried on for a double reason:

In the first place, the traditional forms of religion had their origin in an outmoded and backward mode of production, to which they were well adapted,--a world

of handicraft and small peasantry, from which society was now lifting itself. This religion rested upon outward forms of devotion and was a narrow, stupid superstition of petty bourgeois and peasants, among whom the pastor or priest was the one and only literate intellectual. In the developed bourgeoisie itself,a different religion was growing up, one which conformed to the needs of a commodity-producing society:the personal faith of an independent bourgeois thrown upon his own resources. In him, the traditional doctrines were losing their force. To this may be added the rapid development of natural science, which, as the basis of the rapid development of technics and of the flowering of capitalism, received at the hands of the bourgeoisie a special care. This science taught the extension of the universe, the laws of nature, the millions of years of the history of life on earth, the evolution of the animal kingdom to man; in all fields of knowledge it contradicted the bible stories as primitive ignorance. And here we have the advent of the keenest among the new views, namely, bourgeois materialism, which is often also given the name of natural-science materialism. It taught that the entire world, inclusive of life and the development of humanity, is governed only thru natural laws, that these natural laws are capable of explaining all riddles of life and fate, and that a higher mysterious power is not needed to that end,and does not exist. Because these thinkers of the bourgeoisie believed that the capitalist development would bring about general well-being and remove all misery, all poverty and all stupidity, they saw all problems as solved or soluble, and no longer had need of any higher power.

The bourgeoisie could not be content, however, with its own abandonment of the old religion, but was obliged also to attack and combat it. For the bourgeoisie wanted to win the power in society out of the hands of princes, nobility and landed proprietors. The power of all these reactionary classes, who wished to maintain what was old and outworn, rested upon the submissiveness of the unenlightened masses, the peasants and petty bourgeois; and this submissiveness was anchored in their religion. Because religion was the foundation and the Church the ally of the traditional power,therefore the bourgeoisie was obliged to conduct the spiritual struggle against religion and church. It had to break this mass away from its spiritual leaders, and convert it into its own following. And this was done by spreading enlightenment and education among this mass and filling it with new ideas. Innumerable are the literary works of a popular scientific cast which came into being around the middle of the 19th century, for the purpose of "enlightening the people", that is,

in order to win the masses for the bourgeoisie, to inoculate them with the political and religious views of the bourgeoisie and so to take the foundation out from under the old ruling elements. And where the struggle became hard and furious, the most radical views were disseminated and materialism attained an added significance.

The reason why this struggle soon came to nothing and was discontinued when the bourgeoisie was master of the state power, and frequently even before that time, will be seen farther on.

II.

In Russia the struggle had to be waged against the same powers against which the bourgeois revolutions were directed in western Europe: the princely absolutism which by means of a horrible police regime held down all stirrings of a libertarian development, and against big landed property which held the peasants in thrall. The struggle had to be waged in the midst of a population which in intellectual respects resembled most the peasant masses of medieval Europe, long before the bourgeois revolution. The russian muzhiks were, in fact, much more ignorant and backward than these latter. In Russia also the Church was a foundation-pillar of the princely power, and even without reserve a subordinate organ of Czarism. There also religion, in harmony with the primitively barbarous economy, was a barbarous blind belief in the miraculous power of saintly bones and of candles, and the simple souls were charmed and intoxicated by means of sumptuous light and glittering gold vestments.

The means by which the Bolshevist Party was able to win the political power and demolish Czarism and the bourgeoisie was this: it championed the economic interests of the peasants, their striving to get possession of the land, against the landed proprietors, set this up as the goal of the revolution and thus won the peasants for its program. But next it had to take care that the peasants should not, subsequently, after they had attained their goal, turn against the Party, take up with a bourgeois policy of their own and to that end make use of their old spiritual power, the Church, as a rallying point. For this reason the reactionary power by which the peasants had hitherto been dominated had to be destroyed, so that the peasants should become supporters of Bolshevism spiritually as well as materially. That was possible only by way of a struggle against the Church, in the most radical form by way of an intensive propaganda against religion in general.

This struggle, which was waged directly thru the "League of the Godless" but with the support of the State, was scarcely distinguishable in character and content from the one which was waged earlier in western Europe by the bourgeois materialists and free thinkers. It had nothing whatever to do with Marxism. And the philosophical polemics of Lenin dating from the time prior to the Revolution (in the complete edition of his works, collected under the title "Materialism and Empiriocriticism") are quite on the level of bourgeois materialism; which, of course, is quite natural since his struggle in Russia was directed against the same sort of opponents. The propaganda in Russia was distinquished from that of western Europe only in the circumstance that it was waged with still more primitive arguments and cruder instruments, because it was directed against a still more barbarous superstition. The procedure has, of course, been described before: the muzhik's understanding of the arguments based on natural science is rather limited; but he sees and hears these godless ones direct the fiercest sort of attacks against God, give utterance to the most terrible blasphemies,--and no flash of lightning from heaven strikes the evil-doers. That proves to him that God doesn't exist, or at any rate doesn't care about what people do here below. And so he draws his conclusions: he lets the priest go hungry, converts the cross into kindling wood and the church into a stable, hangs pictures of Marx and Lenin in his room and perhaps burns candles to them. The younger generation, however, takes up with the youth groups which educate themselves in national economy and natural science, and it takes over Materialism as a recognized and matter-of-course doctrine. In Russia a new generation is growing up, and has been growing up a sufficient number of years to form a new stratum of adults to whom religion is only an historical phenomenon, a superstition of elderly people belonging to the past. The russian Church has gone under with Czarism.

This is not to say that religion generally, in Russia, has disappeared or is surely disappearing. First because we have in fact the occurrence, in limited measure, of what was posited above: where the peasants come into conflict with the government, their revolt assumes the form of a churchly resistance. When their allegiance to the old small-peasant mode of economy comes into conflict with the semi-violent introduction of modern agriculture and large-scale operation in the kolhozes, the peasants seek strength by coming together in the Church, in the old religion, the symbol of what is old and which likewise is being suppressed by the State. The economic struggle is waged in the ideal form of a religious conflict; and the western-european press prints stories about horrible religious persecu-

tions in Russia without a suspicion that these so-called persecutions signify mainly an economico-political conflict regarding the building up of russian agriculture. As a focus of all economic reaction, religion remains in existence.

Besides, as is well known, on the Volga the peasant villages of the Germans maintain their evangelical faith, remaining unphased by the atheistical propaganda. Religion is here a much more deeply rooted personal conviction, brought along from the petty-bourgeois commodity production of western countries, and therefore practically immune to the primitive arguments of the "godless". These peasants become involved in conflicts with the bases of the state-socialist economic system. And so it is quite natural that the prevailing system comes into conflict also with these german peasants; and because the opposed social ideas express themselves in the form of opposed religious ideas,--Atheism on the one hand, and Protestantism on the other--here also the struggle assumes the form of a religious persecution.

Religion is not simply a superstition invented by priests and rulers and which can be combatted by atheistical propaganda. Nor is it a mere outcropping of ignorance which can be destroyed thru indoctrination with natural science. It arises from the incapacity of human beings to control their own destiny. It is an expression of the feeling that unknown and overpowerful forces, of either natural or social origin, are masters over life and destiny. Whether and in what form religion will continue to exist in Russia depends therefore on the country's further economic development. The atheism of the youthful Russia is in harmony with this first period of the rise of state capitalism: the Russians see before them an unrestricted and boundless development toward well-being and superfluity;they see the problems of life as solved and no higher power is needful. But Russia is already becoming involved in world policy, which at the present time is issuing in the derailment of capitalism toward world war, decline, revolution; the dangers which menace the rest of the capitalist world cannot be evaded by Russia, she is not the master of her destiny. Recent press reports are significant in this respect; they state that the russian government, after the treaties with the west-european governments, has now negotiated with the Roman Catholic Church regarding permission of catholic propaganda. If by the side of the prevailing state capitalism there should still remain or arise in Russia private property and commodity production in considerable measure, the acquired Materialism,as against the spiritual effects of this material reality, would become a mere outward form.

III.

Just as the Communist Party carried over the bolshevist methods into the political class struggle of western Europe and America, so it has also copied here the russian method of combatting religion. And so in this question also we are presented with an instructive example of the great opposition between Bolshevism and Communism, as an outcome of the opposition between the primitive russian society of czarist times and the developed capitalism of the West.

Communism, the emancipation of the working class, signifies the end of religion. With the vanishing of earthly misery, there vanishes also the heavenly reflex of this misery. When humanity directs the labor process with conscious design and its own existence is thereby assured, when man is the master of his destiny and is not mastered by any enigmatic superior forces, he then sees the whole world before him with open clarity, and no phantasmagoria of an anguished mind can any longer cloud his insight. But even when this goal is not yet attained, the realization that it <u>will</u> be attained has a liberating effect upon the mind. Historical Materialism, the marxian doctrine, teaches us to understand the social forces. The workers see that there are no mysterious supernatural powers which bring them poverty, misery, war, destruction, but that all these things are outcomes of capitalism; things which they, thru their struggle, can conquer and set aside. Therefore these forces, altho still very powerful, are no longer mysterious; and hence religion vanishes among the working masses who, thru Socialism or Communism, have acquired a basis of marxist insight. This does not come about thru the force of atheistical arguments against religion, by which the workers are convinced and won over. Rather, by reason of the new social insight, the feeling of timid uncertainty is dissipated and vanishes from their consciousness, so that their minds become accessible to arguments which in reality they scarcely need any more, and their religion goes by the board.

A profound difference exists between the marxist historical Materialism and the bourgeois Materialism dating from the middle of the last century. The latter thought to be able to explain human society by means of natural laws and was quite unaware of the fact that society has its own laws. Marxism points out these laws of society by which the development of humanity is conditioned. Bourgeois materialism believed that thru knowledge of the natural laws and thru their application in technics, man could master his destiny

and thereby also become spiritually free. But this application, the development of Capitalism, gave rise to still greater misery and to unknown powers which were still more formidable. Marxism explains these powers and enlightens the workers regarding the manner in which the workers themselves, with the aid of this science, can conquer them. The opposition of the two kinds of materialism comes forth most clearly in their respective conceptions of religion, the one regarding it as a simple effect of ignorance regarding nature, the other as an effect of social factors. And on this basis we see that the manner in which religion is combatted by Bolshevism is quite on the plane of bourgeois materialism.

If religion were nothing more than a product of ignorance, it would have had to vanish more and more among the educated class, the bourgeoisie, in the last half-century of increasing scientific knowledge and constantly better instruction. But what do we see? That during this time this class, even its intellectual part, has grown more and more religious. Of course it is often said that this is merely owing to the fact that the bourgeoisie has an interest in maintaining religion among the people and therefore supports religion by its own example. No doubt this comes into play among other things, but it is not the main matter. With such superficial views regarding its opponents, the proletariat can only weaken itself. The bourgeoisie is not made up, intellectually, of hypocrites any more than it is composed, economically, of evil-doers and politically of blockheads,--regardless of what the propaganda of party politicians thirsting for power would have us believe. The religious sentiments in this class are for the most part genuine, and we shall endeavor to show that such is quite in the nature of things.

Religion is the fantastic form in which people give expression to their unconscious sentiment of their connection with the universe, so long as they do not know the real connection. Man has always been dependent on the world for his existence and this dependence will continue to exist because man always remains a part of the world and his life is a part of the total process of universal history. But in the periods of history which lie behind us he failed to realize clearly this dependence and to master it. In the early times of primitive cultural conditions, the means of living were offered him by way of natural phenomena independent of his will, (sunshine, rain, fertile soil); but at the same time, powerful forces were capable of destroying him. More recently, by means of technical devices, later supported by natural science, he learned

to direct these natural forces, to use them and draw them into his service. His life became richer and more secure.This was followed,however,by the advent of social forces, arising out of the forms of production in which , with advancing technology,people worked together in ever greater units:tribes and, later on, cities and nations, leading to states and classes. Struggle of the tribes for land,struggle of the cities and states for trade and profit, struggle of all against all in sharp competition,struggle of the classes for their share of the product and for power, war and crisis in modern times -- all these things, as mighty forces,drove people forward and brought them success or decline. The individual felt powerless, and was so in fact; happiness and disaster were not dependent on himself. While he lived in the midst of a world of constantly richer possibilities, brought about by way of collective human effort, but without conscious design and plan, he was visited by catastrophes and threatened with extinction by forces which he did not understand and failed to master, forces which likewise were brought about by way of collective human effort, but also without conscious design and plan. This dependence on a world totality standing high and mighty above him and beyond his understanding expressed itself in a feeling of fear and dejection, occasionally of confidence and calmness, but always of subjection to the sublimated personifications of these forces, hence in religious feelings.

In the modern capitalist class, two tendencies are working counter to each other. On the one hand, its technical power has never revealed itself so mighty as in the present period, the period of the rise and perfection of aerial navigation, the enormous acceleration of international communication, spiritual and material, of the refinement of machine technique and of the more substantial interweaving of labor and science.That which previously had been noted as an astonishing compendium of unconscious growth - man's mastery over nature and the natural forces - was now proudly proclaimed as the program of a consciously directed technico-scientific advance. Thus there arose in the bourgeoisie the consciousness of unlimited possibilities, the feeling of beeing capable of everything.This was especially true of the masters of production,the world's economic leaders, who saw themselves as the directors of human destiny. The spiritual reflex of this tendency was not so much materialism, insight into the natural forces of the world,as cynicism, contempt for what others revere.

In the midst of this feeling of confidence, however, another sentiment was at work even long before the advent of the present world crisis in which the anarchy

of capitalist productin has driven its masters to desperate exertions and fearful doubt regarding the future.For the menace of the proletarian Revolution has hung like a sword over the bourgeoisie from the very time of its rise to power. As soon as the working class, a half-century ago, began to organize,took up the struggle and proclaimed its sccialist goals, it was all up with the self-confidence of the bourgeoisie. And thereupon the bourgeois Materialism melted away, and only feeble remnants of it have been at work since that time in a part of the petty bourgeoisie and of the workers. For it was now revealed that natural science could not liberate humanity and that technics under capitalism could bring no general happiness, no peace, no freedom. The future grew dark and uncertain; the bourgeoisie saw its world full of incomprehensible and menacing forces. And so there arose in the class all sorts of mysticism and superstition.

The bourgeoisie has been shaken in its self-confidence by two catastrophes:first the World War, then the world crisis. And now there hangs over it like a tormenting storm cloud the menace of a still more devastating world war. The bourgeoisie does not have its world in hand.Powerless and without an idea as to what is to be done, it stands confronting the irresistible power of these social forces. And when they have again been unleashed, it sees the rise of the working class,which is still for the time being calmed by means of unemployment relief to exorcise hunger revolts, and still held in check thru the possibility ofparliamentary protests or thru hope of a better economic order promised from above. But after all it hears the rumbling in the depths, it sees here and there the flashing up of the new ideas which lend force to a coming revolution,it is thinking more about the revolution than the workers themselves do, and it is making ready to proceed against it with the sharpest means at command.For the bourgeoisie can see in revolution and Communism nothing other than chaos, extinction of all culture and the end of humanity.And yett it feels instinctively that it is powerless to evade this catastrophe.Thus there arises in this class more and more strongly the belief in a super-human. supernatural power by which the world is goverrned. And it clings still more strongly to this belief because of the feeble hope that in this way perhaps the workers may be held back from their goal and the strength which lies in their unity may be broken.

IV

The rise of the socialist labor movement in the last half-century is the first case in the history of humanity in which irreligion has become a mass pheno-

menon. These masses had brought religion with them as a tradition out of their earlier petty-bourgeois or peasant mode of production. But, thrown together as workers into capitalist industry, they learned to conduct the class struggle, they learned a few things regarding the development of society to socialism, they recognized that their deplorable situation was owing to natural and understandable causes, and they saw the possibility of putting an end to that situation thru their own strength. In the most important practice of life, their minds had occasion to concern themselves only with realities, with the understanding of real things, and so the traditional fantastic thinking was bound to be dispelled and gradually vanish. This process is still going on.

The connection between society and ideas is not to be conceived mechanically as a formula, prescribing necessarily to each definite class a definite mode of looking at things. Society works upon us continually thru all the influences and forces of our suuroundings, hence upon each of us differently in various particulars; and so the doctrines impressed upon us in youth and the traditions of earlier states of existence are gradually overcome, in one case more rapidly and in another more slowly. Differences may also occur in accordance with occupation: wherever workers are exposed to unforseen catastrophes -- as in the case of miners and fishermen -- even tho they may know that inadequate safety measures play a part under capitalism, there remains in their minds a deeply rooted religiosity.

Another factor to be considered is the development of the labor movement itself. In the early days of its rise, when clear indoctrination with principles prevailed, the enlightenment was the most thorough-going. When, later, the great droves of fellow-travelers arrived, - those who came to socialism only by reason of electoral successes and direct interests, not by reason of a profound transformation of their basic views, -the traditional religion which they had brought along out of their petty-bourgeois surroundings remained practically unaffected. When the Social Democracy became a party like any other, in competition with the others, and the churches learned to compete with it by way of social slogans, social measures and labor organizations of their own, the dissemination of materialistic thinking among previously religious workers came to an end. There is also the fact that the theoretical indoctrination as well as the inner assurance regarding the future are weakened as a result of the reformistic degeneration of the movement. The bourgeoisie proves to be more powerful, the goal farther away and duskier than was formerly thought. And the

devastating forces of society reveal themselves, in war, in general disorder, in world crisis, mightier and more uncontrollable. All that could be opposed to them was merely a certain vague belief that finally after all the workers would win. But this belief expressed itself more as an ethical love of peace and declarations of the fraternity of the peoples than in strong and militant preparedness for the revolution. It is obvious that in such a labor movement tendencies of a religious coloring come forth more and more strongly and a sort of christian socialism gains in influence. And so we find, together with the political, also an intensified spiritual rapprochement with the bourgeoisie.

In apparently complete opposition thereto, we have the anti-religious propaganda of the Communist Party, which, following the russian example, includes in its activities that of combatting religion directly .Such a thing may appear quite radical, especially to those workers who themselves were obliged to overcome the religious traditions and have continually met with religion as a great impediment among their comrades. But in reality it is very superficial, remaining attached to the surface and the outer layers. To be radical is to get at the roots of things. The root of religion is the social essence, in this case the dependence and powerlessness. To attack this root requires --so long as society is not itself transformed -- the bringing of such insight into the social development as to give rise to the certainty that liberation can be attained thru human effort. It is only that which can set aside the power of religious thinking. It does not come about thru theoretical discussions directed to demonstrating the falsity of religious dogmas; that is nothing more than an attack upon the outer form, upon the effect, while the cause, the inner essence, is left unclarified. Only a clear understanding of the forces by which society is driven and of how the thinking and acting of human beings are determined by vital needs of an economic nature,-it is only this that makes the belief in supernatural explanations superfluous and senseless. Without this understanding, however, unbelief or atheism is just as much a dogmatic belief and just as lacking in solid foundations as is religion.

The atheism which is being propagated by the C.P. and the vague religiosity of many socialist circles are, one as much as the other, bourgeois mades of thought. Atheism and religion have this in common, that they are unconscious expressions of a sentiment produced in human beings by society. They are accordingly both dogmatic; that is, they regard themselves as absolute

truth and combat and persecute each other because they hold the opposed ideas to be determining as regards the practical struggle. In making use of the name Materialism as the doctrine of reality -- the doctrine which investigates, with a view to understanding,only reality, the real forces of the world --we at the same time deney that atheism has any right whatever to bear this name. As a descendant of bourgeois . materialism, atheism sees, to be sure, the reality of nature, but not the reality of society, hence only that of the less significant half of the universe. Its value is that of an empty hull, of a negative solution, because it merely asserts that the religious explanation of the world, the one by means of super-natural beings, is out of order,The thing that might give it a positive content, -- the real explanation of the world's development, a clear knowledge of the forces and their effects by which our life is gover-ned,--that is lacking. This content can be given only by Marx's historical materialism.

It was said above that the C.P. has propagated atheism and combatted religion, but the statement is in real-ity too favorable. It is the free thinkers who combat religion with fairly considered arguments. What has been done by the organs of the C.P. was not much more than jeering and offensive outbursts against religion. It is perhaps the clearest indication of the intellectual poverty of the communist parties that, in their intellectual dependence on Bolshevism,they came out in western Europe against religion with the same simple means with which the muzhiks were impres-sed in Russia. And of course it was not intended as serious combat,--in such matters, that is beyond the capacities of the Russian Bolshewiks,--but was desig-ned merely to harass the bourgeoisie and to impress the workers with a bit of theatrical boldness.It is the old method of external appearance in the place of inner strength, --a method which is at work also in their policy of employing high-sounding words,behind which there is only a reformistic striving for out-ward successes with a view to power.And as proof by example to show how faintly communist and how comple-tely bourgeois this alleged materiallism is, there comes as the last somersault the slogan of tolerance: now that Russia is making its peace with the western powers,the Communist International seeks to get on the good side of the bourgeoisie and, to that end, pro-claims religious tolerance, the old bourgeois prin-ciple.

To the bourgeoisie , it <u>is</u> a principle. The bourgeoi-sie has received -as a troublesome legacy from the earlier centuries when class struggles were reflected

in religious differences - the various religions and churches, now contracted to rigid articles of faith. In spite of the fact that each must assume, according to his own doctrine, that the other fellow is forever lost, one must respect the other's belief, as otherwise no business could be conducted among the different sects. Business does not admit of any dispute about religious beliefs, and business is the main matter. And so in the capitalist world one must tolerate. Also in the case of political affairs.

The real communism is not tolerant. A communist worker whose deepest desire is to bring his class to a strong unity of action does not tolerate having his comrades remain without understanding of the social development. He knows that so long as clarity is lacking regarding society, the mind is filled with some belief or unbelief. The conversion of a belief to an empty unbelief does not bring his class any strength. He will set about with all his power to provide insight, clarity, understanding of society, insight into the goal and the struggle of the working class, in order that the workers may see with clear eyes the reality of the world by which their destiny is determined. It is then that the supernatural traditions lose their force. In this way the unity of action of all workers as a strictly coherent and conscious class is prepared and secured.

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0

Forthcoming Articles in the Council Correspondence

The Land of Promise : German Imperialism : Marx and Lenin on the State : Bolshevism in Spain ? : The Council Movement in England : Dictatorship of the Intellectuals? : The Capitializing of Asia : Planned Economy Nonsense in the Labor Movement : Competition and Average Rate of Profit; The Unemployed ---------
and other interesting articles.
Solicit subscriptions for the Council Correspondence, so taht we may improve and expand it.

0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0

P A M P H L E T S :

World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution
What Next for the American Workers
Marxism or Leninism
The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism
Bolshevism or Communism

All five for 25 cents.
Order from: Council Correspondence, 1604 N. California Ave.
Chicago, Ill.

C L A S S S T R U G G L E I N W A R

Second World War Inevitable.

The first world war was a consequence of the rise of German imperialism which began seriously to threaten the power of England and France, German heavy industry, more modernly equipped than the English, was a dangerous competitor in the world market. At the same time German imperialism reached out its tentacles to the raw-material districts hitherto dominated by England and France. The famous epidode in which the cruiser 'Panther' was sent to North Africa to demonstrate for the mining interests of the German Mannesmann concern in Morocco was an eloquent example of this. Mainly, however, the power of German imperialism was directed toward Asia Minor (Bagdad Railway, Balkan policy, annexation by Austria of Bosnia and Herzegowina, etc.). The developments, following the Balkan wars, finally resulted in the world war.

Today similar signs appear and the forebodings of a new world war are increasing. Another world war is inevitable, for the development of the productive forces cannot be arrested and with their development the newer countries become imperialistic and fight for a place in the sun against the older ones. Since the Asiatic countries have been drawn into the circle of world capitalism and machine production has been introduced there, and because they begin with a technique and productive methods at the highest stage of development, these young capitalist countries reach an enormous degree of economic, political and military power. They demand "their share" of the world market and try to secure for themselves raw material sources.

Japan, not undeservedly called the Germany of the East, in many respects recalls the situation of Germany in 1914. In addition it must be remembered that the semi-feudal conditions in the interior of Japan make possible a degree of working class exploitation that seems impossible even today in the older capitalist countries. It seems that Japanese capitalism has become a competitor that can no longer be defeated by economic means.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Japan swallows one Chinese province after the other, while extending economic control over the more distant territories of English and Dutch India, Australia, etc. That English imperialism is vitally threatened thereby is well known, and therefore it is generally expected that the occurrences in Eastern Asia are but the prelude to the new world war.

Russia's development to an industrial and military power of the first rank intensifies the strain of the situation further. Russia, too, is trying to extend its influence in China (Soviet China, uprisings in Turkestan and conflict over the Chinese-Eastern railway, 1929). Full and skillful advantage is being taken of the disintegration of the great Chinese empire which no longer represents an economic or political entity.

The big conflict over a redistribution of the world can break out any moment, therefore all countries are arming at a feverish pace. The great battle will not be long delayed. Probably it will not begin directly as a world war but as a conflict between two countries into which the others gradually will be drawn. Therefore every armed conflict today between two countries is at the same time an advance skirmish to the second world war.

The Ideological Preparation for the Second World War.

Armaments are proceeding with feverish haste in all countries. But they are not limited to the production of physical means, such as tanks, poison gas, bombs, etc. More important that these is the ideological preparedness for the war, so that, above all, the working masses will participate enthusiastically. A working class forced to participate in war against its will means resistance and insubordination; and strikes that endanger the successful pursuit of war break out too easily. No matter how well equipped technically the war machine may be, it can function in case of war only if supplied with all necessities by the labor in the factories of the whole working population. That is why the ruling class must, above all, prepare the working class ideologically. A systematic propaganda, equipped with all the means of modern society, has long been at work to influence the thinking of the working masses to create the belief that in case of war they will be fighting to protect their own interests.

Of course this ideological preparedness is not accomplished by openly proclaiming that the conflict will be over the redistribution of markets and raw material sources. The workers are called on to defend "their own" (national) culture, as was done in the world war of 1914. Then it was the horrible specter of bloody Czarism with its savage Kossacks that was used to drive millions of German workers into the arms of the militarists. The French workers were urged to overthrow the Prussian rule of force and German monarchism while the English and American workers were fighting to bestow the blessings of Democracy on the world.

Today similar methods are invoked.

The hopeless economic conditions in Middle Europe have forced a union of all national forces thru which monopoly capitalism gained the strength to begin the struggle for a redistribution of the world. The fascist governmental form, which subordinates all capital and working forces of the nation, is but the preparation of these countries for this struggle soon to begin. Fascism and National Socialism thus drives irresistibly toward war. However, this is also true of the great powers of the West, altho with them it is a question of maintaining their privileged position. What they have seized and stolen in the course of years, they want to keep. Both fascist and democratic powers are driving toward war. Capital in the fascist countries must extend its sphere of power; capital in the democratic countries cannot permit this and heads for "war against fascism". This struggle of "democratic" against "fascist" capital is skillfully being camouflaged into a struggle in which the working masses will be directly interested.

In the fascist countries the great capitalist powers of the West are accused of exacting tribute from the whole world and the whole "people" are rallied to fight as one to find the way out of need and misery to a better future. In the western countries, on the other hand, Fascism and National Socialism are exposed as the rule of force that barbarously suppresses all free expression and above all robs the workers of their political rights and independent organizations. Therefore the slogan "Against Fascism! ", becomes the rallying cry of all open and concealed partisans of the ruling class and serves to enroll the broad masses in the war front.

Revolutionary workers will not be fooled by such propaganda. They know that the war is not over Fascism; that victory for one as for the other means no better future for them. It is a matter of indifference to them who the victors may be in this struggle for a redistribution of the world. They know they will have to pay the bill no matter who wins.

The condition of workers in the "democratic" countries is generally better than in those where fascism rules. But this does not mean that fascism is to blame. If the living standards of the masses are higher in countries like England, France and Holland, than in Germany, it must be remembered that capital there has greater reserves, that have been accumulated by unbridled exploitation of the colonies. This exploitation of the colonies still makes possible comparatively good standards for workers in Western Europe. Counterbalancing this is the immeasurable misery of the hundreds of millions of the colonial populations. On the other hand, living standards in the fas-

cist countries did not drop because fascism seized power, but fascism became predominant because of worsened economic conditions.

A new war only brings greater misery and sharper exploitation for the working masses. Whoever wants war against fascism in order to arrest the further decline in living standards deceives himself. The workers will gain nothing by their support of such a war.

Must not the working class defend the political rights granted by bourgeois democracy against Fascism? Can they sacrifice without struggle what generations of workers have achieved and what has been realized only at the end of the last war: free and universal suffrage, right of organization and assembly, freedom of the press, i.e. bourgeois democracy also for the working class? No one can deny that fascism when it destroys these recently acquired rights confronts the working class as an enemy. But he who concludes that therefore the working class in the democratic shall join its bourgeoisie in war against the fascist countries deceives not only himself but the working class as well.

The ruling class in the democratic countries are no less of an enemy to the working class than the master class of the fascist countries. It is an illusion to believe that the working class in capitalist countries can use bourgeois democracy as a means to defend its interests within these countries; that it can assert itself thru it and finally will be able to use it as the lever to secure political power. The working class never possessed such power. On the contrary, the working class never received political privileges until the great labor organizations were able to insure that no "misuse" of their privileges would occur. Those privileges were not to be used to enforce the interests of the working class against the ruling class. Where such efforts have nevertheless been made, the recognized labor organizations openly aligned themselves on the side of the ruling classes. They denounced such efforts as illegal and declared as wild-cat strikes those actions of the workers that refuse to subordinate themselves to their compromising leadership. Then, political rights, right of assembly, freedom of the press, and the right to organize and strike are abolished by the democratic order as efficiently as by the fascists. Armed force is on parade and demonstrates the absolute power of the owning class.

Those political rights that the working class can exercise only thru the recognized labor organizations serve only to subordinate the working class to the democratic order. They merely impose the duty of submission to the labor leadership and to the ruling class. But the fiercer the class

struggle, the more the workers are compelled to fight without political rights and against the labor organizations who use these rights as the means of proletarian subjugation.

It is but a step from this condition to the general abolition of political rights and democracy when the labor organizations prove unable further to restrict the activities of the working class.

In Germany and Italy these measures by the ruling class have already been taken and undisguised dictatorship has become a fact. In the countries as yet democratic there need be no doubt that the same methods will be pursued once the labor organizations recognized by the state can no longer "deliver" the working masses. The stern reality of an intensified class struggle destroys the illusion that "political rights" lead to the emancipation of the working class, and the workers are confronted by the undisguised dictatorship of the ruling class. The bourgeoisie is as fascist here as there. It is its own bourgeoisie that binds the workers to capitalist domination by means of "democracy" and "political rights", and applies the open fascist dictatorship when democracy fails.

The working class must fight capitalism everywhere, regardless of whether it uses democratic or fascist forms of government. It is exploited by capital in a democracy as well as under fascism. Therefore we workers can be indifferent about who wins the victory in the war. A class conscious worker cannot think of supporting his "own" bourgeoisie; he has only one enemy - the ruling class that oppresses him. Whether his "own" country's war activities suffer thereby, even tho the military defeat of his "own" bourgeoisie were to result from this attitude, he has no reason to adopt a conciliatory attitude toward his "own" ruling class.

The workers everywhere in the world are an oppressed class. If they are to emancipate themselves from wage slavery and take over control of production, they must everywhere and at all times fight the owning classes.

The Jingoism of the "Working-Class Movement"

The so-called working class movement has already assumed the role of driving the workers to war on the side of "their" national bourgeoisie. The owning class never tires of professing its love of peace, while in order to "insure" peace it increases its armaments. Similarly, the Social Democracy and the trade unions proclaim themselves the champions of peace, while preparing the masses for a war against Fascism.

The bourgeois slogan "In times of peace, prepare for war", is adapted by the labor movement to read: "If we want peace, we must prepare for war against fascist Germany and Italy". Of course they (still) condemn the imperialism of the democratic countries, but fascist imperialism receives the bulk of their condemnation. The socialist parties and the trade unions with their bureaucracies no longer present a hostile front to the democratic state. The state recognizes them; their function is that of mediator between bourgeoisie and proletariat in the democratic order. The democratic state forms the basis of their existence, - a victory of fascist imperialism threatens that existence. Fascism where victorious with the destruction of democracy also destroys the labor organizations based on democracy and replaces them with the fascist party organization. The old labor organizations disappear, but the classes remain within a new, fascist framework. The capitalist class of the democratic countries makes its peace with fascism. It can adopt fascism in its own country without recourse to war. It can become co-ordinated (gleichgeschaltet) under the fascist imperialism; can make the fascist dictatorship over the proletariat its own.

Not so the labor bureaucracy. Its existence is interwoven with that of bourgeois democracy. It is an instrument of that democracy and therefore defends and fights not only for democracy, but for its own priviliged position when it demands war against the fascist countries.

Since the emergence of Russia as a great-capitalist power, the policies of the Third International have also been changed. Russia follows a policy of alliances with other capitalist powers and the policies of the Third International have been adapted to this new trend.

In France, which has entered into an alliance with Russia, the Communist party has formed a united front with the Socialists and thus has joined the "national front". In the other countries, too, such as England, Holland and Belgium, this united front has become a chief objective. The slogan for this united front wooing is: "Rally all forces against fascism." They say Nazi-Fascism threatens the national independence of the masses in all democratic countries. The Communists should stand in the first ranks of the fighters for national independence.

With this the Third International has joined the front of "ideological armament"; it co-operates with the ideological preparation for war that is essential for the waging of any modern war. In this respect, conditions differ from 1914. Then many workers had not expected the co-operation of the Social Democracy and the trade unions with the bourgeoisie. Like lightning in a clear sky came the

surprise of the war and also the betrayal of the working class. Today, when everyone is convinced that the war will break out any moment, both fronts are already occupied. There is no doubt today that the so-called labor movement will co-operate. Not only, as Bebel said in 1912, by shouldering the musket in the hour of danger in order to defend the fatherland, but by preparing the workers for the war with constant and insistent propaganda at this early stage.

National Independence and Leninism

The question of nationality and especially the defense of national independence plays an important role in the labor movement. With Marx we say, "the workers have no fatherland!" The nation is the organizational framework within which the owning class regulates the exploitation of the oppressed class. But the struggle of the working class is aimed at the abolition of this exploitation, and the owning class of a nation with its national exploitation organization. In this conflict the workers of all countries confront the exploiters of all nations as comrades, and their aim is the communist organization of production throughout the world. Therefore, a proletarian revolution cannot stop at national boundaries. It smashes, if it has the power, all national boundaries in order to build the communist world order. The revolution, instead of stopping at national boundaries, fights to abolish them, - not the defense of national independence, but its destruction, is its aim. The victorious working class builds the communist world economy in place of the various nations in constant warfare with each other. If this world economy is divided into districts of production, these divisions are not national barriers because such an organization has no exploitative character, - the districts are not antagonistic to each other.

Revolutionary Marxism has long expressed itself unequivocally on this question. It remained for Lenin to surrender this concept and to sow confusion in the camp of the workers with the theory since known as Leninism.

"Leninism" teaches that oppressed nations fighting for national independence are the allies of the proletariat. The theory therefore demands that workers of countries oppressed or threatened by the imperialist powers assist their own bourgeoisie in the struggle against the foreign oppressor. Thus the Third Internationalurged the workers in Lithuania to defend their fatherland against Poland; the proletariat of Turkey was urged to support its ruling class in the defense of national independence,while Soviet Russia gave material aid to the economic and military strengthening of the Turkish nation. The Turkish nation in turn showed its gratitude by suppressing strikes and

other forms of the class struggle with barbaric severity.

Similarly, the national war of deliverance in China was hailed as revolutionary in the proletarian sense and the Chinese proletariat was urged to rally to the support of the Kuomintang (People's Party). The bourgeois General Chiang Kai Shek was honored by the Communist International as the leader of the Chinese "Red Army", and the impression was created (in 1927) that the world revolution would start anew in China. It took but a short time before this illusion spread by the Third International was shattered. The young Chinese bourgeoisie took clever advantage of the working class support in Canton, Shanghai, etc., while national independence against imperialist England, America and Japan was at stake. But hardly had it secured a measure of independence when it turned against these same workers. On command of the same "red" general, Chiang Kai Shek, a reign of repression ensued that was marked by barbarous mass executions, tortures and massacres, without consideration of their previous service to the Chinese "nation". The workers were caught completely by surprise. They were not prepared for this. Had not the Communists themselves pictured Chiang Kai Shek as the red general, the leader of the revolution?

The president of the United States gave birth to the twin of this Leninist theory, namely, the "right of self determination of nations". After the war, this theory served the imperialist powers in partitioning up the Austrian monarchy, in the cutting off of Germany from important markets and sources of raw material, and to create independent border states around Russia. Their purpose was to prevent any of these countries from becoming great powers and the "right of self determination" served them to good purpose in this.

The "national independence of oppressed nations" of Leninism, where realized, has the same effect as Wilson's "self determination of nations". Both are supposed to safe-guard the existence of the small independent countries against the imperialist great powers, but interpretations differ on the application of the theory to specific cases. Then the great powers decide in line with their own interests and the safe-guarding of their own power. Soviet Russia thus strives to develop forces that will resist the great imperialist powers, but only to strengthen its own position.

Thus this theory, whether in its Wilsonian or Leninist form, plays a role in the quest for power of the ruling classes in the new capitalist countries where a young bourgeoisie strives for political independence, as well as in the policies of the modern industrial countries (including Russia) that support national "independence" or "self determination"

where it accords with their interests, but fight and destroy it where it conflicts with them.

The Third International not only championed the national independence of Turkey, Lithuania and China, but in the period from 1921 to 1925 Germany was included in the list of countries oppressed by the imperialists whose national interests must be defended. The secret military treaty (Rapallo 1922) between bourgeois Germany and Soviet Russia was justified on these grounds. This treaty enabled the German bourgeoisie to build factories in Russia for the manufacture of war supplies that Germany, according to the Versailles treaty, could not erect within Germany itself. With Russia's help, the German bourgeoisie was armed in its struggle against the imperialist oppressors, France and England. When this "national emancipation" of Germany finally assumed the form of the National Socialist Hitler government, hostile to Russia, the Third International reversed its former attitude to Germany. Germany is now damned as a fascist imperialist country, the worst enemy of the national independence of small nations, whose national independence is threatened by Hitler fascism.

The Leninist theory of the struggle for national independence has caused enough mischief in the German revolutionary movement since 1921. Leninism, as propagated by the German Communist Party, demanded co-operation with its own bourgeoisie in resistance against sanctions by the entente and the occupation of the Ruhr by French troops.

The Communist Party claimed to be the national party of Germany and Clara Zetkin offered the government the assistance of the Red Front Fighters. And all this while the masses in various parts of Germany were in revolt against the bourgeoisie.

And this phase of Leninism has not yet been out-grown. In 1916 in "Against the Stream," Lenin wrote that wars of national liberation in Europe are not impossible. The first practical application of this theory was in the national emancipation struggle of "oppressed" Germany, and today it reappears in the United Front tactic that throws the various Communist parties into the "struggle for national independence" of the countries that are threatened by the now "free" fascist Germany. The Tribune of Holland, Oct. 2, 1935, says: "But Lenin has already pointed out,-among others in his discussion of the Junius pamphlet of Rosa Luxemburg,-that even for the future national wars are not impossible in Europe and not every war in Europe need be an imperialist one. The Seventh World Congress of the Communist International now presents this possibility in concrete form. Why? Because the victory of German fascism, which is the chief force driving toward war, threatens the national independence of a number of small states. Such

countries as Czechoslovakia, the Baltic states, Austria and Holland are indicated.

The Seventh World Congress considered it likely that in case of war in defense against fascist attacks the national bourgeois resistance would assume the character of a national war of liberation.

While Holland, for example, is not immediately threatened, its bourgeoisie would be not only that of a small nation, but the oppressing, imperialist bourgeoisie of a great colonial empire.

What is the duty of Communists in such a situation? The Seventh World Congress answered: "The Communists will fight in the front ranks of the struggle for national independence."

Again the Third International is being used to throw the revolutionary working class into the struggle for the interests of the industrial great-state Russia, and Leninism supplies the theory for the justification of the fact that the working class is thus being surrendered to the national bourgeoisie and the war craze.

The Fourth International (Trotzky Opposition) and"Leninism".

The so-called Fourth International of which Trotzky is the prophet which is still in the hopeful prospect of organization claims to be the unadulterated representative of Leninism. It advocates the support of oppressed nations in their struggle for national liberation."Unser Wort", Sept.1935, No.9, Trotzky half-monthly organ, says: "An international boycott against Italy and its Allies in the Abyssinian war must be organized. Every shipment, every Italian ship on which there are goods for Italy must be stopped". Further on in the same publication of that date it says: "The proletarian can emancipate himself only if he simultaneously fights for the emancipation of the oppressed colonial nations. The proletariat therefore fights for the victory of Abyssinia and the defeat of Italy. The only question is with or against its own bourgeoisie.....We must expose the fraud of imperialist sanctions and advocate revolutionary proletarian sanctions against the world bourgeoisie. The proletariat with its own organization must carry on the boycott not only against Italy's war but against the war preparations of Great Britain as well. The transport workers' strike in all imperialist countries must be advocated and organized."

The "Neue Front", Nov. 21, 1935, says: "Before any of the others, we have advocated the determined defense of Abyssinia; but also before the others, we have opposed the

sanctions of the league of nations and advocated those of the working class.....If the sanctions are left in the hands of the imperialists, the working class loses all control of future developments and helplessly confronts the danger of war consequent to the sanctions."

The "Nieuwe Fakkel", Holland Trotzky organ, of Sept. 6, 1935, calls for the defense of the rights of the Abyssinian people, but not in common with the British government because the latter is concerned only with the power and prestige of British imperialism."

Very well, they want independent action of the working class. But, overlooking that such action in reality fits into the plans of the English government, or of the League of nations, or of the Second or Third International, the question arises: what are these peculiar rights of the Abyssinian people? So far as we know, there exists no "people" for the revolutionary working class. That concept remains for the ruling class. The "independent nation" consists of classes that stand in direct contradiction to each other. The rights of "the people" always were but the rights of the ruling class.

Ethiopia forms no exception to this. On the surface, the Italo-Ethiopian war appears as a conflict in which Ethiopia appears as the defender of national independence. In reality what takes place is a conflict between two great-capitalist powers: England and Italy. Ethiopia had long been partitioned off among the great powers, to the disadvantage and dissatisfaction of the Italian bourgeoisie. They demand expansion of their sphere of interest, and the free disposal over the still remaining mineral resources. What the feudal exploiting caste of Ethiopia does or does not want, does not matter. This caste, still trying to maintain these medieval methods of exploitation has subordinated itself entirely to the league of nations,--in this case, France and England. Ethiopia fights for national independence only insofar as it desires to perpetuate the existing conditions of exploitation. But in this fight for "national independence" it must subject itself to the interests of the great powers. Ethiopia is but a figure on the political checkerboard that is moved at will by the great powers. "Independent" Ethiopia, therefore, has not made a single independent move in this whole matter, but from the beginning has allowed England to dictate its policies. Italy is not waging war against an independent Ethiopia, but against England; a war as yet fought on Ethiopian soil because England must conserve and prepare its forces for greater conflicts to come.

In the Italian-Ethiopian conflict, the imperialist antagonisms of the great powers have unavoidably collided. So far this conflict is but a preliminary of the incipient

second world war; it can become the spark to ignite the whole capitalist powder barrel. This does not mean,however, that the second world war must follow directly.

The ruling powers, of course, will try to avoid the world conflagration as long as possible; for, though they may know where they begin, no one can say how it will end. In the final analysis, it is not the will of the ruling powers that decides, but the necessity of maintaining their control. All the more is it the duty of revolutionary propaganda to fight the ideological hegemony of the ruling class to prevent complete destruction of the working class.

The Fourth International, which, even as an opposition to the Third International, still defends Soviet Russia, has accepted Leninism as its political guide. But Leninism is a theory adapted to Russia's development as an industrial great-power, and drives the workers who support it irresistibly into one of the imperialist fronts.

Prevention of the War.

The attitude of the labor organizations on the war problem offers a gloomy picture. The Social-Democratic and Communist parties and labor unions already have joined the national fronts. The Fourth International adopts an equivocal attitude; it wants to fight against fascism and for the "independence of oppressed nations", but at the same time also against the internal bourgeoisie.But equivocation in such a question is impossible; it leads either to political bankruptcy or to a theoretical opposition to all imperialism simultaneously with actual support of one.

Besides the various political and trade union organizations already in the tow of nationalism there are still various groups, such as pacifists, revolutionary idealists, anarchists and left Marxists, etc., though few in number who refuse to be drawn into the whirlpool of nationalism but direct their energies to prevent war. The question is only - can the war be "prevented"? This can be answered only after reviewing what the working class can do, what forces it has at its disposal, what implements of resistance it has and what objections are aimed at in resisting war.

Will the masses in case of war carry on an independent policy? Will they, in opposition to all political parties, unions and the government, reply to the mobilization order with the general strike and insurrection? So far, there are no indications of this. The masses would have to fight against the state and the whole so-called labor movement, and would have to carry on independently under their own direction. True, here and there signs of such a struggle

are visible, but in view of the great forces they would have to oppose in case of war, their influence seems negligible.

Since the waging of war becomes a question of existence for the ruling classes in the various countries, they prepare in advance against any pacifist or proletarian interference with their plans and immediately, at the outbreak of war, will ruthlessly suppress any attempt on the part of the masses. Therefore war against war cannot be waged in the sense of "preventing" it; the question involved is one of power. It is <u>not</u> a question of "<u>preventing" war</u>, but one of whether the working class can <u>entirely vanquish</u> the capitalist class and <u>establish its own control over society.</u>

The propaganda of the general strike to prevent war does not reckon with this eventuality. Of course the anarchists attach the slogan: "Thru the general strike to the social revolution", to their general strike propaganda. But in this form the slogan is sterile, because it presents a completely erroneous picture of the revolutionary process. For the general strike as conceived by the anarchists is an illusion. They picture the strike as a general and complete cessation of work by all proletarians. In actuality, however, the mass of workers follows the lead of the big labor organizations and is under the spell of nationalist ideology. The opponents of war, at its outset, constitute but a small minority. The illusion of the general strike and of the social revolution that is to follow, then collapses like a house of cards.

It is otherwise, if the social revolution is not viewed as an appendage of the general strike, but as a <u>process</u> that follows its course in time, thru "peace" and war, to its final conclusion. This process is the process of the evolution of the masses under their own direction. The official labor movement has no further concern in the defense of the class interests of the masses, because its essential element is one of cooperation between capital and labor which can result only in a worsening of the conditions of the working class. The class interests of the proletariat can be defended only by the sharpest struggle against the bourgeoisie and the old labor movement. This conviction is slowly gathering strength. That this is so is proved by the mass movements of recent years in Spain, France, Belgium and Holland. Among the workers the conviction is growing that every friendly relationship with the bourgeoisie must be destroyed,--that the working class can maintain itself only thru a ruthless class struggle against the capitalist class.

Thus the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat becomes irreconcilable and the world proletariat

finds its unity against the world bourgeoisie. This unity arises out of violent class struggles in all countries. The masses lose their old national conceptions that aim at the co-operation with their own bourgeoisie, making way for new aims - the overthrow of the national bourgeoisie, the destruction of capitalism, the abolition of wage labor and the establishment of a planned communist world economy. That is the revolutionary process of the mass movement. That is the genesis of the social revolution.

Though the concept of the general strike to prevent war is an illusory one, it is yet possible that large groups will resist. Such resistance in the form of mass strikes, although not universal, can be of great importance to the struggle against the war, but they cannot prevent it. Such mass strikes at the outbreak of war are of great value for the future struggle of the masses because they show the methods they will have to adopt finally. They prove indeed that they have not been corrupted by nationalism and that they are still fighting the class struggle; that they are still fighting to overthrow their own bourgeoisie. Mass strikes against war are of an essentially political character; they are not only anti-war actions and anti-bourgeois, but in addition a call to the whole working class to follow their example. Especially in time of war, when every kind of propaganda among the masses has been made impossible, such political mass strikes are indispensable to the revolutionary struggle. They are a rally call; they are an example; they become the program of the general insurrection and of the proletarian revolution.

The Enemy is Within the Country.

The revolutionary worker knows no fatherland. The owning class of the whole world is his enemy. But if he wants to emancipate himself from bourgeois rule, he can do so only by overthrowing the bourgeoisie that rules him. The enemy is his own bourgeoisie. Liebknecht coined the phrase: "The enemy is within our own country". The sentence should be modified. The immediate enemy is within the country, for the bourgeoisie of other countries is no less an enemy. But the working class of each country must first settle with its own bourgeoisie.

But let us not be deluded. At the outbreak of war large sections of the working class are not revolutionary. They are imbued with nationalism. The foreign bourgeoisie appears as their enemy. Powerful war propaganda will see to that. And because mass strikes and other actions against their own bourgeoisie at the same time seem to strengthen the foreign bourgeoisie, large numbers of workers will refuse to strike. Even revolutionary workers will waver at times. Naturally, the fear of fascist imperialism is greater than that of democratic imperialism. This is already

apparent in the attitude of the Trotzky Fourth International in the Italian-Ethiopian war, when it calls for the defeat of Italy in favor of Ethiopian victory. How much greater will be the influence of this fear on the policies of these groups if their own democratic country is threatened by the fascist or National Socialist enemy. And when the fascist enemy is strengthened or assured of victory by the class struggle against the internal bourgeoisie, we can safely predict that these groups will recoil from the consequences of such action. But the war will intensify suffering and misery until they are unbearable, and eventually forces the masses to resist. Then it becomes clear that the immediate enemy is within the country. The resistance of the working class grows and leads to mass movements. Then it will become apparent to what extent the essential character of this mass movement is understood by the workers, for on this largely depends the outcome of the movement. The more the workers realize that mass movements, directed and carried out by the workers themselves, are not mere actions of misery and desperation, but at the same time contain all elements of communist society, the more revolutionary will these movements become. They then aim directly at the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the rule of the workers' councils.

The task of the revolutionary workers, inseparable from the task of the working class as a whole, is clear. He who has freed himself from the magic formula, general strike, as the first step in the social revolution, who has finished with Leninism and its "defence of the independence of oppressed nations", who realizes that the prevention of war is possible only if the working class seizes power, and who is indifferent whether the internal bourgeoisie or the "enemy" are victors in the war, for him the matter is clear.

The workers in all countries, freed from the old movement with its democratic and other illusions, have only one goal: the development and strengthening of the independent mass movement of the workers in the whole world--in peace as well as in war--until the masses of the proletariat have seized <u>all</u> social functions and thus build the communist society throughout the world.

(Taken From RAETE KORRESPONDENZ)

# #

Order from Council Correspondence:
<u>Rätekorrespondenz</u> ,(theoretisches-und Diskussionsorgan für die Rätebewegung.) Herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommunisten (Holland).
Einzelnummer 10 ¢

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

On the Communist Party

Dictatorship of the Intellectuals?

Critical Remarks on the Reflections of MAX NOMAD

"The New Middle Class"

State Capitalism in America?

Vol. II **No. 7**

JUNE 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

apparent in the attitude of the Trotzky Fourth International in the Italian-Ethiopian war, when it calls for the defeat of Italy in favor of Ethiopian victory. How much greater will be the influence of this fear on the policies of these groups if their own democratic country is threatened by the fascist or National Socialist enemy. And when the fascist enemy is strengthened or assured of victory by the class struggle against the internal bourgeoisie, we can safely predict that these groups will recoil from the consequences of such action. But the war will intensify suffering and misery until they are unbearable, and eventually forces the masses to resist. Then it becomes clear that the immediate enemy is within the country. The resistance of the working class grows and leads to mass movements. Then it will become apparent to what extent the essential character of this mass movement is understood by the workers, for on this largely depends the outcome of the movement. The more the workers realize that mass movements, directed and carried out by the workers themselves, are not mere actions of misery and desperation, but at the same time contain all elements of communist society, the more revolutionary will these movements become. They then aim directly at the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the rule of the workers' councils.

The task of the revolutionary workers, inseparable from the task of the working class as a whole, is clear. He who has freed himself from the magic formula, general strike, as the first step in the social revolution, who has finished with Leninism and its "defence of the independence of oppressed nations", who realizes that the prevention of war is possible only if the working class seizes power, and who is indifferent whether the internal bourgeoisie or the "enemy" are victors in the war, for him the matter is clear.

The workers in all countries, freed from the old movement with its democratic and other illusions, have only one goal: the development and strengthening of the independent mass movement of the workers in the whole world--in peace as well as in war--until the masses of the proletariat have seized all social functions and thus build the communist society throughout the world.

(Taken From RAETE KORRESPONDENZ)

# #

Order from Council Correspondence:
Rätekorrespondenz ,(theoretisches-und Diskussionsorgan für die Rätebewegung.) Herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommunisten (Holland).
Einzelnummer 10 ¢

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

On the Communist Party

Dictatorship of the Intellectuals?

Critical Remarks on the Reflections of
MAX NOMAD

"The New Middle Class"

State Capitalism in America?

Vol. II **No. 7**

JUNE 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

∴ Published at 1604 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois ∴

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

I.

During the world war small groups in all countries arose, convinced that out of this ordeal of capitalism, a proletarian revolution must ensue, and they were ready to prepare for it. They once more took the name of communists, forgotten since the old times of Marx in 1848, to identify themselves from the old socialist parties. The Bolshevik party, then having its center in Switzerland, was one of them. After the war had ceased, they united into communist parties standing for the proletarian revolution, in opposition to the socialist parties who supported the war politics of the capitalist government; and represented the submissive, fearful tendencies in the working class. The communist parties gathered all the young fighting spirit in its ranks.

Contrary to the theory that not in a ruined but only in a prosperous capitalistic country the workers could build up a true commonwealth, the communists put forth the truth that it was the very ruin of capitalist production which made a revolution necessary and would incite the working class to fight for revolution with all its energy.

Opposing the social-democratic view, that a parliament chosen by general suffrage was a fair representation of

society and the basis of socialism, the communists put forth the new truth, stated by Marx and Engels, that the working class, to attain its aims, had to take power entirely in its own hands, and had to set up its own dictatorship, excluding the capitalist class from any share in the government.

In opposition to parliamentarism, they put forth, following the Russian example, the soviets or worker's councils.

In the defeated Germany, November 1918, a vigorous communist movement sprang up and united the Spartacus group and other groups which had secretly grown up during the war. It was crushed the following January by the counter revolutionary forces of the socialist government. This prevented the rise of an independent, strong communist power in Germany, animated by the spirit of a highly developed modern proletariat, therefore the communist party of Russia entirely dominated the young rising communist groups of the world. They united in the Third International, which was directed from Moscow. Now Russia remained the only center of world revolution; the interests of the Russian state directed the communist workers all over the world. The ideas of Russian Bolshevism dominated the communist parties in the capitalist countries.

Russia was attacked by the capitalist governments of Europe and America. In defense, Russia attacked these governments by inciting the working class to rebellion, by calling them to world revolution - a communist revolution, not in the future, but as soon as possible. And if they could not be won for communism, then at least for opposition to the policy of their governments. Hence the communist groups were forced to go into parliament and to go into trade unions, to drive them as an opposing force against their capitalist governments.

World revolution was the great battle cry. Everywhere in the world, in Europe, Asia, America, among the oppressed classes and the oppressed peoples, the call was heard and workers arose. They were animated by the Russian example, feeling that now thru the war, capitalism was shaken from its foundations, that it was weakened still more by the economic disorders and crisis. They were just small minorities, but the masses of the workers stood waiting, looking with sympathy towards Russia, hesitating still because their leaders said that the Russians were a backward people and because the capitalist papers spoke of atrocities and predicted an inevitable and rapid breakdown. These very infamies of the capitalist press, however, showed how much the example was hated and feared.

Was a communist revolution possible? Could the working class conquer power and defeat capitalism in England, France and America? Certainly not. It had not the strength that was needed. Perhaps in Germany only.

What ought to have been done then? The communist revolution, the victory of the working class, is not a matter of a few years; it is a whole period of rising and fighting. This crisis of capitalism could only be the starting point for this period. The task of the communist party was to build up the power of the working class in this period step by step. This perhaps is a long way, but there is no other.

The Russian Bolshevik leaders did not understand world revolution in this way. They meant it to come immediately, in the near future. That which had happened in Russia, why could it not happen in other countries? The workers there had only to follow the example of their Russian comrades. In Russia, a firmly organized party of some ten thousands of revolutionists, by means of a working class of hardly a million, within the population of a hundred millions, had conquered power, and afterwards by the right platform it stood for and by defending their interests, it won the masses to its side.

In the same way the rest of the world communist parties comprising the most eager class conscious, able and energetic minorities of the working class, led by capable leaders, could conquer political power if only the mass of the workers would follow them. Were not the capitalist governments ruling minorities also?

The whole of the working class which now suffers from this minority rule has only to back the Communist Party to vote for it, to its call, and the party will do the real work. It is the vanguard, it attacks, it defeats the capitalist government and replaces it, and when in power it will carry thru communism, just as in Russia.

And the dictatorship of the working class? It is embodied in the dictatorship of the Communist Party, just as in Russia.

Do as we did! This was the advice, the call, the directive given by the Bolshevik party to the Communist Parties of the world. It was based upon the idea of equality of Russian conditions with the conditions in capitalist countries. The conditions, however, were so widely different that hardly any resemblance could be seen. Russia stood on the threshold of capitalism, at the beginning of industrialism. The great capitalist countries stood at the close of industrial capitalism. Hence the goals were entirely different. Russia had to

be raised from primitive barbarism to the high level of productivity reached in America and Europe. This could only be done by a party, governing the people, organizing state capitalism. America and Europe with their high level of capitalist productivity have to transform themselves to communist production. This can only be done by the common effort of the working class in its entirety.

The working class in Russia was a small minority and nearly the whole population consisted of primitive peasants. In England, Germany, France and America nearly half or even more than half of the population consisted of proletarians, wage workers. In Russia there was a very small, insignificant capitalist class without much power or influence. In England, Germany, France, America a capitalist class more powerful than the world had ever seen, dominated society, dominated the whole world.

The Communist Party leaders, by proclaiming that they (the party) should be able to beat the capitalist class, showed by this very assertion that they did not see the real power of this class. By setting Russia as the example to be followed, not only in heroism and fighting spirit, but also in methods and aims, they betrayed their inability to see the difference between the Russian Czarist rule and the capitalist rule in Europe and America.

The capitalist class with its complete domination of the economic forces, with its money power, its intellectual power, does not allow a minority group to vanquish and destroy it. No party, though led by the ablest leaders, can defeat it. There is only one power strong enough to vanquish this mighty class. This power is the working class.

The essential basis of capitalist power is its economic power. No political laws issued from above can seriously affect it. It can only be attained by another economic power, by the opposing class, striking at its very roots. It is the entirety of the workers who have to come into the field, if capitalism is to be overthrown.

At first sight this appeal to the whole of the working class may appear illusionary. The masses, the majority, are not clearly class conscious; they are ignorant as to social development; they are indifferent to the revolution. They are more egotistic for personal interests than for solidarity for class interests, submissive and fearful, seeking futile pleasures. Is there much difference between such an indifferent mass and a population as in Russia? Can anything be expected from such a people rather than from that class conscious, eager, energetic, self-sacrificing, clear minded communist minority?

This, however, is only relevent if it should be a question of a revolution of tomorrow, as conceived by the communist party.

For the real proletarian revolution, not the superficial chance character of today, is essential, which is determined by the present surrounding capitalist world. The real communist revolution depends on the deeper essential class nature of the proletariat.

The working class of Europe and America have qualities in itself that enable it to rise with a great force. They are decendants of a middle class of artizans and farmers who for many centuries have worked their own soil or their own shop as free people. They therefore aquired skill and independence, capability and a strong individuality to act for themselves, persistent industry and the habit of personal energy in work. These qualities the modern workers have inherited from their ancestors. Dominated thereafter during one or more generations by capitalism, they were trained by the maohine to regular intensity and discipline in collective work. And after the first depression there grew in them, during continual fighting, the new rising virtue of solidarity and class unity.

On these foundations the future greatness of the revolutionary class will be built up. In Europe and in America there are hundreds of millions of people who possess these qualities. The fact that as yet they still stand before their task, that they have not yet finished it, that they hardly made a beginning, does not mean that they are not able to perform it. None other than their own power can tell them how to act; they have to find their way themselves by hard suffering and bitter experience. They have brains and they have hearts to find out and to do it and build up that class unity out of which the new mankind will arise.

They are not a neutral indifferent mass that does not count when a revolutionary minority tries to overthrow the ruling capitalist minority. As long as they do not actively take part, the revolution cannot be won; but when they do take part, they are not the people to be led in obedience by a party.

Certainly a party in its ascendance consists of the class' best elements, exceeding the mass as a whole. Its leaders usually are the prominent forces in the party, embodying the great aims in their names, admired, hated, honored. They stand at the front and when a great fight is lost, its great leaders are destroyed, the party is crushed. Knowing this, the secondary leaders, or the party officials, will often shrink from the supreme

fight, from the boldest aims. The working class itself can be defeated, but it can never be crushed. Its forces are indomitable; its roots are in the firm earth; as growing green turf, the blooming tops which are mown always come up anew. The workers can temporarily desist from fighting when weakened, but their forces increase continually. A party that follows them in their retreat cannot recover, it must lose its character and repudiate its principles; it is lost forever. A party, a group, leaders, have limited force which is entirely spent, is sacrificed in honor, or in dishonor in the events of the class struggle; the class itself draws upon an unlimited store.

Prominant leaders can show the way, parties in their principles and platforms can express the ideas, the aims of the class only temporary. At first the class follows them, but then it has to pass them up, putting up bolder aims, higher ideas, conforming to the widening and deepening of the class struggle. The party tries to keep the class at its former lower level, at its more moderate aims, and has to be discarded. The doctrine that a party stands above the class, that it should remain the leader always, being theoretically false, in practice means strangling the class and leading it to its defeat.

We will show how in the communist party this doctrine after its first glorious ascendance led to rapid decay.

II.

These are the principles leading the communist party and determining its practice: the party has to win dictatorship, to conquer power, to make revolution, and by this to liberate the workers; the workers have to follow, to back the party and to bring it to power.

Hence its direct aim is: to win the masses of the workers as adherents, to bring them to its side; not to make them good independent fighters, able to find and to force their own way.

Parliamentary action is one of the means. Though the C.P. declared that parliamentarism was useless for the revolution, still it went into parliament; this was called 'revolutionary parliamentarism', to demonstrate in parliament the uselessness of parliamentarism. In reality it was a means to get votes and voters, followers of the party. It served to detract the worker's votes from the socialist party. Numerous workers who were disillusioned by the capitalist policy of social-democracy, who wished to stand for revolution, were won over by the big talk and the furious criticisms of the C.P. against

capitalism. Now this policy opened a new way for them, to stick to their old belief that by voting only and following leaders, this time better leaders, they would be liberated. These famous revolutionists, who in Russia had founded the State of the workers, told them this easy way was the right way.

Another means was trade unionism. Though the C.P. declared the unions useless for the revolution, yet the communists had to become members of them in order to win the unions for communism. This did not mean the making of the union members into clearly class conscious revolutionists; it meant the replacing of the "corrupt" old leaders by Communist Party men. It meant the Party controlling the ruling class machine of the unions, that it might command the big armies of union members. Of course the old leaders were not willing to give way; they simply excluded the red opposition groups. Then new "red" unions were formed.

Strikes are the schools for communism. When the workers are on strike, fighting the capitalist class face to face, then they learn the real power of capitalism; they see all its forces directed against them. But then they realize more fully the necessary force of solidarity, the necessity for unity. They are more keen to understand, and their spirit is eager to learn. What they learn is the most important lesson, and that is that communism is the only salvation.

The Communist Party varied this truth according to its principles in each strike that it was present to take part, or rightly to take the lead. The direction must be taken out of the hands of the trade union leaders, who do not have the right fighting spirit. The workers should lead themselves. The reason for this statement was because the working class, as you know, is represented by the C.P., therefor the Party should lead them. Each success was used to advertise the Party. Instead of the communist education, which is a natural outcome of each big fight in capitalism, came the artificial aim: to increase the influence of the party on the masses.

Instead of the natural lesson, that communism is the salvation, came the artificial lesson that the communist party is the saviour. By its revolutionary talk, they caught and absorbed all the eager fighting spirit of the strikers, but diverted it to its own aims. Quarrles which were injurious to the workers' cause were often the result.

A continual fight was made against the social democratic party to detract its followers from it by criticism of

its politics. Their leaders were denounced and were called by the most spicy names as accomplices of capital and traitors of the working class. Doubtlessly, a serious, critical exposition showing that social democracy had left the way of class struggle will oper. the eyes of many workers. But now, all at once, the scene changed and an allianœ was offered to these 'traitors' for a common fight against capitalism. This was called solemnly "the unity of the working class restored". In reality it would have been nothing but the temporary collaboration of two competing groups of leaders, both trying to keep or win obedient followers.

To win followers and votes, it is not necessary to call upon the working class alone. All the poor classes living miserably under capitalism will hail the new and better masters who promise them freedom. So they did as the socialist party did; the communist party addressed its propaganda to all who suffer.

Russia gave the example, The Bolshevik Party, though a worker's party, had won power only by their alliance with the peasants. When, once in power, they were threatened by the capitalist tendencies in the wealthy peasants, they called upon the poor peasants as the allies of the workers. Then the C.P. in America and Europe always imitating Russian slogans directed their appeals to the workers and the poor peasants also. It forgot that in highly developed countries of capitalism there lives in the poor peasants the strong spirit of private ownership the same as in the big farmers, if they could be won over by promises they would be but unreliable allies ready to desert at the first contrariety.

The working class in its revolution can only rely upon its own force. Other poor classes of society will often join them, but they cannot give additional weight of importance because the strong innate force which proletarian solidarity and master ship over production gives to the working class is lacking in them. Therefore, even in rebellion, they are uncertain and fickle. What can be aimed at is that they will not be tools in the capitalists' hands. This cannot be obtained by promises. Promises and platforms count with parties, but classes are directed by deeper feelings and passions founded on interests. They can be reached only when their respect and their confidence is aroused because they see that the workers bravely and energetically attack the capitalist class.

The matter is different for a communist party wishing to win power for itself. All the poor who suffer under capitalism are equally as good as followers of the party. Their despair, seeing no sure way out by their

own force, makes them the right adherents to a party that says it liberates them. They are apt to break out in explosions but not to climb in continuous fight. In the heavy world crisis of these last few years the increasing masses of the regularly unemployed, in which the need and the idea of a rapid immediate world revolution became dominant, also turned to the communist party. Especially by means of this army , the C.P. hoped to conquer political supremacy for itself.

The communist party did not try to increase the power of the working class. It did not educate its adherents to clearness, to wisdom, to unity of all workers. It educated them into enthusiastic but blind, hence fanatical, believers and followers; into obedient subjects of the party in power. Its aim was not to make the working class strong, but to make the party powerful. Because its fundamental ideas originated from primitive Russian, not from highly developed capitalistic European and American conditions.

When a party wishes to win followers with all means and cannot attract them by arousing their interest in revolution, then it will try to win them by appealing to their reactionary prejudices. The strongest feeling which capitalism awakes and raises with all its might against revolution is nationalism. When in 1923 French troops occupied the Rhineland and everywhere in Germany the waves of nationalism went high, the C.P. also played the nationalistic game trying to compete with the capitalistic parties. In the Reichstag it proposed a companionship of the communist armed forces, the "red guards", with the German capitalist army (Reichwehr). Here international politics played a part. Russia, at that time hostile to the western victorious governments, tried to make an alliance with Germany, hence the German communist party had to make friends with its own capitalist government.

This was the chief character of all the communist parties affiliated to the Third International; they were directed by Moscow by the Russian communist leaders, so they were the tools of Russian foreign policies. Russia was 'all the workers fatherland', the center of communist world revolution. The interest of Russia should be the prominent interest of the communist workers all over the world. It was clearly stated by the Russian leaders that when a capitalist government should be the ally of Russia against other powers, the workers in that country had to stand by their government. They had to fight their government, in other countries. The class struggle between the capitalist and the workers class had to be made subordinate to the temporary needs and fortunes of Russian foreign politics.

Its dependence on Russia, materially and spiritually, is at the root of all the weakness of the communist party. All the ambiguities in the Russian development are reflected in the position of the C.P. The Russian leaders have to tell their subjects that their state-capitalistic building-up of industrialism is the building-up of communism. Hence each new factory or electric power plant is hailed in the communist papers as a triumph of communism. In order to encourage the minds of the Russians in perserverance, they were told by their papers that capitalist was nearly succumbing to a world revolution and envious of Russia, meditated to make war with Russia. This was repeated in the communist papers all over the world, while at the same time Russia was concluding commercial treaties with these capitalist governments. When Russia made alliances with some capitalist states and took part in their diplomatic quarrels, the communist papers glorified this as a capitulation of the capitalist world before communism. The papers continually advertised Russian 'communism' before the workers of the world.

Russia is the great example; hence the Russian example has to be imitated in the communist party. Just as in Russia, the party has to dominate the class. In the Russian party the leaders dominate because they have all the power factors in their hands. In the same way the C.P. leaders dominate. The members have to show 'discipline'. Moscow, the "comintern" (Central Committee of the Third International) are the highest leaders; at their command the leaders in every country are dismissed and replaced by others.

It is natural that in the other countries there are doubts that arise among the workers and members as to the rightness of these Russian methods. But such opposition was always beaten down and excluded from the party. No independent judgment was allowed; obedience was demanded.

After the revolution the Russians had built up a "red army" to defend their freedom against the attacks of the "white armies". In the same way the German C. P. formed a "red guard", bodies of armed young communists, to fight against the armed nationalists.

It was not simply a workers army against capitalism, but also a weapon against all the adversaries of the C.P: Wherever oppositions arose at meetings and other workers criticised the party politics, the red guards at the command of their leaders were to deal with them, with maltreatment. Not opening their brains, but breaking their skulls was the method employed against criticising fellow-workers. Thus young and eager

fighters were educated into rowdies instead of educating them to become real communists. When the national revolution came, when national violence proved too far stronger and more irresistable than communist violence, numerous young workers who had learned nothing but to beat their leaders' adversaries, at once changed their colors and became just as zealous nationalists as they were before zealous communists.

Thru the glory that radiated from the Russian revolution, thru its own gallant talk, the C.P. assembled year by year all the ardent enthusiastic young workers under its colors. These young workers were used either in idle sham fights or spilt into useless party politics; all these valuable qualities were lost to the revolution. The best of them, disillusioned, turned their back on the party and tried to find new ground in founding separate groups.

Looking backward, we see the world war, as a culmination of capitalist oppression, arouse the revolutionary spirit of the workers everywhere. Barbarous Russia, as the weakest of the governments, fell at the first stroke, and as a bright meteor the Russian revolution rose and shone over the earth. It was another revolution, than the workers needed. Its dazzling light, first filling them with hope and force, blinded them, so that they did not see their own way. Now they have to recover and to turn their eyes towards the dawn of their own revolution.

The communist party cannot recover. Russia is making its peace with the capitalist nations and taking its place among them with its own economic system. The communist party inseparably linked to Russia is doomed to live on sham fighting. Opposition groups split off ascribing the decay to false tactics of some particular leaders, to diversify from the right principles. In vain; the basis of the downfall lies in the principles themselves.

- J. H. -

::::::::::::::::::::::::::::

DICTATORSHIP OF THE INTELLECTUALS?

(Critical Remarks on the Reflections of Max Nomad)

I.

The historical development being extremely complicated, the historians are free to select the most various starting-points. The marxist interpretation is based on the growth of the social forces of production; history is here a history of class struggles. The fact that the Marxists have devoted more attention to the essential factors of history and gladly left to the novelists and biographers the task of drawing in the "human-all-too-human" factors which it likewise indubitably contains--a defect which is at the same time a virtue, as being a manifestation of methodical and rational thinking--is over and over again seized upon by critics and employed as an argument against Marxism. Of course, the refutation of such criticism presents no difficulties; it merely becomes necessary to consider afterwards the unessential accompanying manifestations which had been neglected, a matter which is the easier the better one knows the truly decisive factors here at work.

One can write a history of class struggles in which the internal and personal strivings and group struggles within the real class contests are left out of account. In this case, one has not said everything, to be sure, but he has said the most important. One can, conversely, because he has a more romantic idea of matters and also because he may want a larger circle of readers, write an extremely colorful history which does not pass beyond the reflections of the phenomena in the brains of the acting personages, a history which in its concern with the narrower personal strivings forgets the broader social factors. This latter procedure is not only a concession to the prevailing ideology, but also facilitates the task of the writer himself; in this way he is in a position to present the course of history in a manner which has the appearance of being logical, while he himself is not required to possess any thoro knowledge of economics and sociology, but may rely exclusively upon his "knowledge of human nature", which in turn rests largely upon knowledge of one self.

It is no doubt possible to note throughout the course of history that the shrewd have continually outwitted the stupid, that deceivers were deceived, that in all previous class societies individuals and groups have

struggled for political power to the end of securing material advantages and that the broad masses thereby involved merely constituted the springboard of the successful; that hitherto, insofar as the poor themselves were concerned, the change of times merely brought them repeatedly a change of exploiters. It is true that in this way history is regarded superficially; that is, the external phenomena are confused with the essence of things. Still, it is possible to pass off such an historical glossary as factual material which is incontestible and thereby pay compliments to "good common sense".

There are half-truths which are really such, and other half-truths which if not further developed become nonsense. If one sees in the history of the past and present nothing more than struggles for privileges--struggles limited for the most part still to the political instruments of power and generally not coinciding with the positions of economic power but dependent on and controlled by the latter--if one isolates these struggles from the real class-struggles whose basis is necessarily economico-sociological and not individual-egoistic,--in such a case one cannot fail to see in the coming development nothing more than the repetition of past history, and "good common sense" is served once more with the popular ejaculation: "Thus it has been, thus it is and thus it will remain". And in this way one finds himself in the comfortable position of the sceptic, who--granted, of course, that this philosophy does not stand in the way of his continued existence--finds the world all the more agreeable the lousier it is, and for whom the whole of history has no other raison d'etre than to confirm the correctness of his position.

The ideological, generalizing interpretation of history which is characterized by lack of recognition of the decisive factors here at work, that is, the development of the productive forces, and which is compelled to have recourse to such things as the "nature" of human beings, things which are no less changeable than the social orders themselves, offers the working class practically and theoretically nothing with which their vital problems could be solved. Since there will still for a very long while be "stupid" and "clever" persons, and since even after economic equality has been attained some time will still be required before there is any likelihood of intellectual equality, there is no foreseeing on this basis when the struggle against exploitation will lead to more than a change of exploiters. The question of <u>who</u> exploits the workers, however, is something which they can afford to disregard; their goal and need is the abolition of any and all exploitation. The consolation which seeks to base itself on the possibility

of a permanent economic opposition on the part of the oppressed is only a half-consolation, since this continued class-struggle, even if not forever, still for fairly long stretches of time can be prevented precisely thru the employment of the instruments of power in the hands of the rulers; a state of affairs which makes it permissible to envisage the prospect that, under certain circumstances, long generations may be deprived of any possibility of modification of their wretched condition. Thus while the purely ideological interpretation of history offers no explanation of the past, and is incapable of seeing beyond the present, since all its presuppositions are bound to remain speculative, so likewise on the basis of that conception the present-day class struggle can be neither theoretically or practically furthered.

II.

Marxism sees in the opposition between Capital and Labor the great contradiction of present-day society, a contradiction thru which it is finally doomed to go under. Within this great, comprehensive contradiction, which can be abolished only thru the setting aside of capitalism, narrower contradictions arise, exist and pass away, all of which must be considered in the framework of the former. One of these many contradictions is that between intellectual and manual labor, a contradiction which is at the same time an expression of two different modes of life and hence of differences of interests. As to how far this narrower contradiction is capable of modifying, in the course of time, theories which relate to the greater contradiction between Capital and Labor, and the extent to which this narrower contradiction itself undergoes transformations, can be determined only thru ever renewed investigations of the concrete situations. The relation between manual and intellectual labor shifts in the same way as the relation between Capital and Labor proceeds toward its abolition.

The problem of the intellectuals is very closely bound up with that of the middle class, by which the greater part of the intellectuals is furnished. It has affected the labor movement from the beginning, and in the course of time it has called forth the most varying appraisals. And yet there was never a time when the uproar about this question was so great as at present, and this clamor is made by none other than the intellectuals themselves. The seeming importance of this social group is in reality, however, merely a matter of excessive self-esteem which must become the greater and more necessary in the proportion to which this stratum loses in importance. We have to do here, as a matter of fact, merely with the reaction of the intellectuals to their social depreciation.

We have no intention, within the limits of these notes, of taking up the problem of the intellectuals in its whole extent, but wish to concern ourselves only with a certain position on the subject, namely, with the view which today finds expression in the writings of Max Nomad. Being an intellectual himself, Nomad shares with his group colleagues the present-day tendency to overrate the importance of the intellectuals, and which at the same time is an overrating of the importance of the middle class. The marxianly oriented labor movement is to Nomad essentially a movement of declassed middle elements and upstart self-educated workers who are striving for privileged social positions, and see in their intellectual capacities their "capital" which is to help them to that end. The broad working masses, on the other hand, serve these elements, in their selfish ambitions, merely as a means.

The fact that the first industrial and social reforms were demanded and in part put thru by far-sighted bourgeois, not in opposition to but in the interest of a profitable and rational economy, gave rise to the idea that the middle class was presented with the task and the possibility of becoming an attorney in matters of social justice. Intellectuals stemming from the middle class have also over and over again sought to accomodate themselves to this idea. The slow but sure process of elimination of the early-capitalist middle class, thru the capitalist development, aroused the social sense of its intelligent elements, and the new intellectual and administrative functions arising thru the same process brought parts of the middle class into positions which provided them with a larger social perspective. Their better schooling with respect to the workers enabled them to usurp the more agreeable phases of the social division of labor; and the colossal "intellectual superstructure" which the expanding capitalist world had had to shape for itself, the enormous number of parasitical but capitalistically necessary social institutions which increased in proportion as capital accumulated, created a broad stratum of intellectual workers who, tho stemming from the middle class, yet soon became differentiated from it. The "liberal" professions, which could still afford the luxury of liberality, and the more complicated industrial professions whose importance was increasing with the progress of technics,--engineers, chemists, managers, etc.- soon came to form a socially important stratum whose significance was recognized in the labor movement as well. Even the legal reform movement of the workers assured a part of the intelligenzia new possibilities of existence, socialist ideas acquired a market value, and many persons succeeded in making of socialism a career without the necessity of being paid by organizations.

While there were individual instances of impoverishment among these elements, and other instances in which intellectuals succeeded in making the leap into the ranks of the bourgeoisie, still the group itself is neither identical with the genuine proletariat nor can it fully identify its interests with those of the bourgeoisie. While to most of them reliance upon the bourgeoisie is a vital necessity, a smaller part is permitted the luxury of having a "conviction", that is, of coming out for socialism which is designed to do away with the intelledtuals as a special social stratum. The ascendancy of the class struggle between Capital and Labor in the present-day economic system compels the middle class to decide for one or the other; in either case it has to fall in with strivings which are foreign to itself; a matter in which it can never be wholly successful. Even tho certain of them actually succeed in overcoming the inner and outer petty-bourgeois restrictions still clinging to them and in playing a truly valuable part in the class struggle, still the influence of the group as a whole upon the labor movement is an unwholesome one. Its world is not the world of the proletariat; it can no more disregard its own necessities than the proletariat is capable of renouncing <u>its</u> with immunity.

There is no doubt that the intrusion of petty-bourgeois elements, the intellectuals, was one of the causes of the degeneration of the labor movement. This degeneration had first become possible, however, only as a result of the capitalist-imperialistic upswing which rendered reformism not only possible but also necessary. In this period, only a labor movement constantly growing more "corrupt" was capable of existing and it was only for this reason that the intellectuals were ready and in a position to take over its ideological leadership.

Mass organizations in non-revolutionary times are of necessity reformistic, and any reformist organization is possible only thru the existence of an intellectual and organizational bureaucracy. Laws are not made in factories, wage contracts are discussed over the green table. The negotiators have to be schooled; the average worker is no match in this field for the contracting party on the capitalist side. He needs representatives, needs intellectuals, needs the bureaucracy; and the greater the scope of the reformist activity, the greater must become also the bureaucratic apparatus of the labor movement, and the more importance attaches to the intellectuals. Parliamentarism needs clever speakers, the trade-union horse-trading needs persons versed in the law, the legalism of democracy needs representatives schooled in the national economy. In brief, if one engages in politics within the framework of capitalism, he needs capitalist politicians.

Anyone who did not wish the degeneration of the old labor movement was obliged to speak out against reformism. Anyone wanting to do away with the bureaucracy was obliged to quit asking for practical results,and remain a sectarian, an example of consistent though untimely thinking. Reformism was the labor policy within the framework of capitalism on the upgrade. Revolutionary ideas could not seize the masses;the historical "shortsightedness" of the workers corresponded best to their immediate interests. Anyone who desired to play a part during this period was obliged to be a rebel and renegade at the same time. The breaking away from the traditional ideology and the acceptance of new ideas receiving lip service in the labor movement was permissible only to the rebellious natures among the middle class; if they wanted to play a role, however, they had to become renegades. To the self-educated workers striving for positions within the labor movement, only the same possibilities stood open. Even though they did not solve the "social question", still at least they solved their own problem. It was not so much the "nature" of these people,--this nature is the nature of all human beings,--but rather the possibility of employing this nature gainfully and corrupting it safely,which enabled renegadism to become the fashion. This corruption was in strict conformity with the temporary interests of the masses represented by these leaders.

Capitalism in the various stages of its development has continually produced rebels, and just as necessarily converted them, with few exceptions, into renegades. This was only the reflection, within the labor movement, of the movement of the middle class itself,which was destroyed and at the same time formed anew. The struggle of the workers against the intellectuals could practically be only a struggle against the labor bureaucracy or, as today in Russia, a struggle against state bureaucracy. The struggle against the intellectuals in private-capitalist countries has meaning only so long as there is reformist activity and reformist organizations, that is, only so long as it is ineffective;for, as already stated, reformism is the realistic labor policy under capitalism on the upgrade. At a certain level of the decline period of capitalism, a level at which there can no longer be any reformist activity or any independent labor organizations, the struggle against the intellectuals becomes temporarily superfluous. It is not until and unless a state-capitalist revolution has been successful, it is only then that the struggle against the bureaucracy and hence against the intellectuals is taken up again and with redoubled fierceness. Any state bureaucracy whose existence is based on the mastery over the means of production,and which assures this mastery by means of a governmental

apparatus in opposition to the workers, must of necessity not only maintain the inequality of the various occupational groups arising thru the division of labor, but even for a time increasingly promote it. This safety measure is the more necessary--even though not always possible--the more the governing authority becomes centralized.

III

Marx and Engels themselves were of middle-class origin; and the same holds of the founders of the extra-marxist labor movement. It was only in course of the growth of the socialist labor movement that more and more labor leaders arose from the ranks of the proletariat. Still it was always the intelligenzia which was regarded as the ideological exponent of Socialism, among the Socialists as later also among the Bolsheviks. As they saw it, members of the well-to-do, educated classes arrived at the insight that true social progress was to be sought in the labor movement, and they put themselves at its service. This recognition on their part--the "revolutionary consciousness"--they then carried over onto the masses. These latter took up with the ideas which had been popularized for them, a matter which was the easier as reality furnished continuous confirmation of the correctness of the socialist theories. Slowly but surely, the socialist ideology was thus disseminated, and it seemed to be only a matter of a relatively brief space of time until the preponderant majority of the population would think, vote and act as socialists. Socialism was just a matter of educating or influencing the masses, a question with which there was practically bound up the conquest of reforms. One bit of ideal and practical socialism after the other was attained, until finally the "truth" would be wholly triumphant.

To this growing Socialism, the growth of the bureaucracy was quite a matter-of-course. The browth of the bureaucracy was also, however, at the same time the increase of its power and sphere of authority over and against the workers. It formed the "State" within the labor movement, rewarded and punished as it saw fit, and from being a "servant" of the organization became its master. The masses existed for the bureaucracy; the workers had merely nurtured for themselves new parasites.

Waclaw Machajski, whose theories are at the basis of Max Nomad's thinking, had quite early recognized in the growing bureaucracy of the labor movement an element hostile to the worker's interests. He realized that the marxian dictum, that the "liberation of the working class can only be its own work", holds literally, that no one either would or could solve their problems

for the workers. This clarity of Machajski's was unfortunately clouded thru the influence which the social-democratic ideas had acquired even in himself. The aspirations and hopes of the labor bureaucracy and of the intellectuals in the movement had thrown him off the track. These latter as well as Machajski himself conceived the course of history, the transition from capitalism to socialism in exactly the same manner. To the reformist bureaucracy, the growth of the social-democratic and trade-union ideology and practice was at the same time the increase of the influence and power of that bureaucracy, from which it concluded that the further development would make a mere child's game of the taking over of the State and the reconstruction of economy; and Machajski fully shared this conception, though, to be sure, with different feelings. What the former yearned for and on which they congratulated themselves, Machajski feared; but both attitudes looked forward to the same development. While to the Social Democracy, furthermore, the social question was solved with the taking over of the governmental authority, to Machajski the class struggle still went on until the attainment of complete economic equality, which,permitting of equal educational possibilities, would give rise to the gradual disappearance of the opposition between workers and intellectuals, and not until that time would a truly socialist society be assured.

The Bolsheviks who were enabled, on the basis of favorable circumstances, to seize the political power in Russia, if not along social-democratic paths, yet with social-democratic ideology, and by whom the state capitalism which alone is possible there is passed off first as a transitional stage to socialism and today as completed socialism, seemed to Machajski and his followers to furnish the most magnificent confirmation of the correctness of their doctrine. Of course, they were then obliged to assert, in common with the Bolsheviks, that the russian state capitalism was actually in conformity with Socialism as conceived by the Marxists. They had to support the bolshevist falsification in order to find their own argument confirmed. Just as Machajski's ideas arose from the pretensions of the social-reformist bureaucracy, so the "concrete" demonstration of their correctness was based on the acceptance of the bolshevist (Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin) perversion of Socialism which is identified with state capitalism.

The russian state capitalism has, however, nothing in common with the marxian "association of free and equal producers". To the Marxist, the "first phase" of Communism is the process of the withering away of the dictatorship of the armed workers and not the extension of the bureaucratic State such as has occurred in Russia.

The first principle of marxian socialism demands the abolition of wage labor. Where wage labor prevails, there prevails exploitation; the one is inconceivable without the other. Reproduction under such conditions can only be the reproduction of exploitation. Russian wage labor, which is being brought to full bloom by the Bolsheviks for the first time and which made it necessary to have recourse to the classifying wage differentiations for the reproduction of the various labor functions, is to Marxism identical with capitalist economy. The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be conceived as a party dictatorship without abandoning Marxism. And in spite of the impossibility of identifying Marxism with russian state capitalism, this impossible equalization is thoroughly involved in Nomad's "factual demonstration".

A great number of workers, even without being aware of Machajski's ideas, have thru the force of facts come to somewhat similar conclusions. The new, marxist labor movement which is already taking form and which has broken with the legalism of the former one and with the party ideology, is quite in accord with Machajski and Nomad in judging the role of the previous labor bureaucracy and of the russian state bureaucracy. If refuses, however, to identify the original Marxism, in spite of the contained bourgeois elements, with the state-capitalist dreams of the social-democratic functionaries and liberal intellectuals or with the state-capitalist russian reality. The revolutionary character of Marxism reveals itself more and more in the contemporary declining capitalism in which the revolution becomes the only remaining practically possible task of the proletariat. Though it is theoretically impossible to identify the marxist doctrines with the falsifying interpretations of the social-democratic or bolshevist epigoni of all shades, yet even if such a thing were possible it would still furnish no proof of the correctness of Machajski's position. It would at most compel the present-day revolutionists to extend their fight against reformism and its culmination in state capitalism onto Marx himself.

However, the desire for objectivity, not dogmatic reverence, compels us to come out against Nomad in his present endeavors to trace the reigning epigonity back to Marx himself, and to discover the roots of the ambitions of the bureaucracy and of the technocratically limited intellectuals precisely in Marxism. Still, insofar as concerns the demonstrable factual material produced by Nomad, we applaud him gratefully, even though we explain the material in a different manner and come to other conclusions. We too see in the more or less conscious state-capitalist strivings of the leaders of

the old labor movement and intelligenzia, and likewise of the russian state bureaucracy, new attempts to maintain class rule, attempts which must be combatted by the working class. But, in contrast to Nomad, we see precisely in Marxism the best weapon in the struggle against these tendencies. The fact that reformism and the russian bureaucracy are throwing overboard the last remnants of marxist thinking, even as a complaisant phrase involving no obligation, and that they are training and nursing new ideologies which are plagiarisms of the capitalist ones, should surely in itself suffice to show what a chasm exists between Marxism and the advocates of state capitalism. (1).

The fact that inconsequential marxist phrases, torn from their context, remain incorporated with the russian ideology is no more to be wondered at than the fact that even the Hitler movement was compelled to operate with socialist phrases in order to win a mass basis. When Nomad in his arguments against Marxism refers to the Bolsheviks, he must first demonstrate the identity of Marxism and Bolshevism; a thing, however, which he has not yet done and which, for that matter, is impossible, and becomes constantly more impossible since the Russians are more and more openly abandoning Marxism, even as empty phraseology.

Nomad may have recourse to the argument that he takes as Marxism what today goes by that name. Just as Christianity cannot be defended with a reference to the early Christians of Jesus himself, so likewise we are not in a position, Nomad once argued, to appeal to the original Marxism, to the purity of its youth, to its early promise; the original containing in the bud what today, in the movement calling itself marxist, has come to full bloom. Apart from the circumstance that the analogy itself is a bit lame, even its acceptance does not dispense with the necessity of demonstrating that Marxism actually and of necessity finds its limit in the present-day pseudo-marxist movement and its state-capitalist aspirations. In order to combat Marxism, Nomad must also attack that marxist current which, like himself, is out

- -

(1). In an article in Scribner's Magazine (June 1934) Nomad mentions the "state-capitalist" plans of Bismarck and states that Bismarck sought to assure himself of Marx's aid in the matter. But this can hardly be alleged as proof of the compatibility of Marxism with state capitalism, even supposing that Bismarck had actually entered into such relations with Marx. As a matter of fact, the whole story is groundless; Bismarck never turned to Marx in this connection, but conducted an inconsequential correspondence with Lasalle, whose opportunism, as is well known, always met with Marx's severest condemnation.

in opposition to bureaucracies and state capitalism and which stands for complete economic equality without delay and without for that reason being in opposition to the marxist doctrine. That, however, he has not yet done, for in fact he needs a corrupted Marxism for his own argument. All that Nomad has so far used as a basis for his critical consideration of Marxism are, insofar as it has had reference to Marx himself, superseded or false utterance of Marx with reference to long-forgotten situations and which by this time are of no significance whatsoever. Marxism itself, however,--that is, the materialist dialectic, the doctrine of value and surplus value, the theory of accumulation, historical materialism, the social average labor hour as the socialist unit of reckoning, etc.--all that has never been touched upon by the "Marx-critic" - Nomad.

But to come back to the problem actually under discussion: Nomad sees in the intellectuals a third social stratum which has special class interests and is in a position to develop an appropriate class consciousness. By the side of the opposition which has arisen thru the previous development of the productive forces, the opposition between Capital and Labor, and which can be overcome only in the classless society, we have here a new historical possibility: the rule of the intellectuals, or "capitalism without capitalists", to quote the title of one of Nomad's magazine articles. The capitalist system, however, is characterized, among other things, by the fact that it cannot be <u>consciously</u> directed by society or even by a certain class; that, rather, the exchange relation of commodity and surplus value production determines all social motion without regard to the will of human beings. It is not the capitalist who controls the laws of the market, but the actions of the capitalists as well as of the other classes are forced upon them by those laws. However, there is no need here for going further into these complications; it suffices to emphasize that just as Capital is incapable of governing its own movement, and just as the movement of the proletariat is dependent on factors which the proletariat itself does not determine, so likewise the intellectuals are not in a position consciously to conduct a policy by which they are aided in acquiring social mastery. Their ambitions are of no importance. The matter to be investigated is: whether the social development is driving in the direction of these ambitions. Such an investigation, however, has not been presented by Nomad, who has still contented himself with the mere assertion.

The class struggle is no more an expression of <u>conscious</u> class action than is the capitalist monopoly, but a necessary result of the economic development and of its re-

flection in the political life. If "extra-human" factors determine the movement of society, so also they determine that of the class struggles and revolutions within this society. The matter to be investigated therefore is: whether the compulsory movement of the middle class and intellectuals can at all come about in the direction feared by Nomad. Apart from the russian example, there is as yet no case and no country in which a political bureaucracy, with the conquest of political power, ruled society also economically. The matter to be investigated is: whether the russian special case is possibly susceptible of being generalized. What has hitherto come about, however, in the middle class and among the intellectuals (2) outside of Russia,was merely a sharpened competitive struggle of the various organizational talents, parasites and political grocer boys for the maintenance of their positions. Not being in the same measure as the proletariat compelled to solidarity, more thrown upon the resource of developing their personal flexibility in the struggle for a livelihood, they have fewer possibilities of coming out as a class than have either the workers or monopolized Capital. The leaning on this or that class, according to the situation of the moment, and if possible under the personal sway of some individual,--that is most in accord with their direct interests. They are compelled to change their horses frequently, until they have realized that as a matter of fact they have nothing to do but ride. Hence the double-facedness of this group: it can go along with Stalin and also with Mussolini. It can drink a toast to the world revolution, and also for the king of England. But one thing it cannot do: it cannot proceed independently--it cannot do Nomad the pleasure of finding his predictions confirmed.

IV

It is interesting to note that Nomad does not clearly delimit his concept of the intellectuals. Frequently he speaks of the middle class in general, then again of the intellectual professions, at another time of these latter in connection with the state bureaucracy, and

- -

(2) The "white-collar slaves" receiving starvation wages and brought together in enormous offices,frequently together with the industrial workers, are by no means regardless of what they may think of themselves, to be entered in the group of Nomad's intellectuals.They are proletarians in white shirts, like the tool makers or mechanics; for the white shirt of these latter also does not free them from the stigma of the worker,though they frequently have higher incomes and better schooling than the great mass of the white-collar proletarians.

then again of the administrative and technical officials holding important posts in the productive process. This conceptual elasticity of Nomad's has furnished good ground for one of his critics to remark that "the dictatorship of the intellectuals is as unthinkable as the dictatorship of the traveling salesmen" (3).

From the very beginning of capitalism, according to Nomad, there developed the <u>independent</u> strivings of the intellectuals. In the poverty which accompanied the early years of the rise of capitalism and which also struck and radicalized the intellectuals, their aims were somewhat identical with those of the proletariat. But with the growth of their social influence, their interests soon broke away from those of the workers, until we find them with the present-day presumption of being able to rule society (4). Here, then, Nomad is speaking of those elements of the middle class which are engaged in the intellectual professions,and moreover of only an infinitesimal minority, that is, of that part of the intellectuals which concerns itself with social problems and of which, again, only a ridiculously small minority developed in the way that Nomad ascribes to the entire intellectual stratum.

The <u>majority</u> of the intellectuals has always gone along with Capital and still today goes along with the ruling class. It works for this latter in the same sense that the workers do. The middle class itself--among which are to be counted, in addition to the better paid elements in industry and trade, also the still remaining autonomous professions, the independent merchants, a part of the coupon-clippers, the peasants, etc.--was never in a position to bind up its interests with those of the proletariat, in spite of the fact that it was slowly squeezed out by the capitalist development.Furthermore, the broad mass of the middle class stands on no higher level intellectually than the present-day working class. The circumstances that, seen from the revolutionary standpoint, on the basis of the general economico-political backwardness, there have been political joinings of forces between petty-bourgeois and workers does not affect the fact that a real union of interests was and is precluded, since the workers as the "heir" of Capital are as a class neither interested in nor capable of postponing their "inheritance" thru the support of the middle class. This latter finds itself today in an accelerated process of decline; it cannot reestablish

- -

(3) Jerome, in "The Communist", April 1933.

(4) Nomad, "Rebels and Renegades", Conclusion.

itself either under Fascism or under Bolshevism (5). And the undeniable fact that the middle class is going under compels Nomad not to ascribe to it as a whole, but only to a part, the intellectuals,--or as it is also commonly expressed today, the "new middle class",--the design and possibility of acquiring the social mastery in the wake of capitalism. Machajski's concept of the intellectuals which contrasted all intellectual work with manual, and in its practical application related exclusively to the state bureaucracy, is here, by Nomad, after the fashion of the social-democratic and technocratic mode of thought, related mainly to the intellectuals engaged in the process of production, the managers, engineers and technicians, to whom the innumerable more or less privileged intellectual salaried employees are subordinated.

Nomad thinks of these persons as the new rising bourgeoisie. Their occupancy of the industrial "command posts" is conceived as representing economic power; and, in fact, the at present particularly favorable treatment of the russian "specialists" seems to demonstrate that the functions of these intellectuals in the labor process carry with them certain privileges. At any rate, it was not until quite late that this group of intellectuals acquired in Russia that esteem which it now enjoys. At the beginning of the Russian Revolution, they were still by no means "Friends of the New Russia", but in part were combatted most bloodily together with the bourgeoisie. Nor in the fascist countries either, in spite of its occupying all the important technical posts, has the material and social situation of this stratum of intellectuals, or of the intellectuals in general, been improved, but rather worsened. The intellectuals as a compact group were not to be had either for the fascist or for the bolshevist overturn; they were neither the initiators nor the beneficiaries of these movements. It was monopoly capitalism itself and the great middle-class stupidity that helped fascism to power, just as it was the needs of the great masses of peasants that enabled the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks. The russian intellectuals are dominated by the russian bureaucracy just as in other countries they are dominated by Capital. They can live under either set of conditions

- -

(5) Millions of the middle class have been completely proletarized by the present crisis. Quite in contradiction to the superficial cry about the increased importance of the "new middle class", this new middle class is itself no more than an indication of the general pauperization. The same laws by which the "new middle class" was created are now engaged in destroying it and thereby also its importance. By way of illustration of this tendency, reference may be made to L. Corey's "The Crisis of the Middle Class."

only by hiring themselves out. No trace of a rule by intellectuals is discoverable under either system. The intellectuals are nowhere identical with the State.

In his bock entitled "Rebels and Renegades", Nomad speaks of the "unmistakable purpose" of the fascist intellectuals: "to gain as much power as possible, both by helping the capitalists to cow the workers, and occasionally also by forcing the capitalists to make concessions to other classes of the population" (page 404). Here, then, he is speaking exclusively of the fascist state bureaucracy, which rules over the intellectuals and if necessary suppresses them just as it does the workers, and both in the interest and at the order of monopoly capital. And it appears that Nomad regards this state bureaucracy as standing "above the classes" as otherwise of course it could hardly force Capital to make concessions. Whether such a thing, however, is at all objectively possible, not to mention the fact that nothing of the sort has so far happened, is a question which Nomad leaves unexamined; here again he is content with the mere assertion. If the second part of this fascist tactic, as Nomad sees it, were practically possible, Fascism would never have come to power. It was precisely the impossibility of further capitalist concessions to the other strata of the population which compelled the capitalists to set up and support a bureaucratic dictatorship which stands at their exclusive disposal. Objectively, Fascism can only suppress the workers and also the middle class; it is not in a position to turn against Capital as well. It is accordingly also incapable of safeguarding the interests of the intellectuals or of being an expression of intellectualist rule. This state bureaucracy is something quite different from the "new social stratum" of managers, organizers, technicians, etc., of which Nomad speaks and which, as he sees it, are becoming the masters of society thru taking over gradually all functions of a technical and commercial sort which originally were performed by the capitalists themselves. (6).

In Nomad's writings, the bureaucratic apparatus appears as an instrument of intellectualist rule. Such a situation, however, does not exist either in Russia or under Fascism or in the american "New Deal". One must surely have an enormous fantasy in order to see in the silly antics of the "new dealers" anything more than demagogy in the interest of the ruling monopoly capital; or to conclude from the higher wages of the russian intellectuals that they have the disposal over Stalin's apparatus; or

- -

(6) Cf. Nomad's article "Capitalism Without Capitalists", in Scribner's Magazine, June 1934, page 408.

from the state aid for german dentists to infer that the fascist apparatus is the valet of the intellectuals; or to find in Mussolini's african enterprise the boldness of the professors and the inventive spirit of the engineers.

Like Hilferding and Lenin, who were too much inclined to regard the process of capital concentration as an actual process of socialization, in spite of the fact that it is not until after the proletarian revolution that the process of concentration is capable of economically realizing the socialization which has taken place, so also Nomad sees this process of concentration even today as actual socialization. As a matter of fact, so long as the capital relation exists, this process of concentration, being determined by the need for profit and accumulation, can only increase the capitalist contradictions. The more the control over economy is centralized, the more is the economy convulsed, the more must the exploitation be intensified and the greater must become the revolutionary ferment. Hilferding's idea that Capital is tending in the direction of a "general cartel", Lenin's conception of a socialism organized after the model of the german postal system, is also at the basis of Nomad's illusion of the intellectualist economy. A capitalist economy concentrated in the state bureaucracy is only monopoly capitalism carried to the extreme. There is no capitalism without capitalists, as conceived by Nomad. There is no fascist country without capitalists; and the russian bureaucracy is at the same time the russian capitalist class, since it fulfills the capitalist functions. These bureaucrats are the exploiters of the labor of the russian proletarians and intellectuals. If today they determine the high salaries of the russian specialists, so they also have the power and are later compelled to lower these salaries again. Even if one is not able to demonstrate to them "in black and white" that these or those means of production belong to them, still as a bureaucracy they have the collective right of disposal over those means. If they have the control over production, so also over the manner of distribution of that portion of the surplus value which is not consumed by the necessary rate of accumulation.

Centralistic control of the means of production is capitalistic control. The means of production in the hands of the producers, by which the technically necessary centralism is not precluded but rendered imperative,-- that is Communism. So long, under modern conditions, as a special group of people has the sole right of disposal over production, this special group must be rated as capitalistic. In Russia, this special group is not the intellectuals, but the state bureaucracy, which of course also embraces intellectuals. But even the highest

russian planning commission is subordinate to the state bureaucracy.

The one thing left to Nomad in order to rescue his thesis of the intellectualist economy would be the complete identification of the intellectuals with the state bureaucracy. Such a procedure, however, would be equivalent to a confusion of concepts and of realities. Even though the state bureaucracy is largely recruited from the middle classes or from feudal remnants (in Russia, in part also from upstart workers, and to a less extent in fascist countries), still in private-capitalist countries it exercises the power only for the ruling capitalist strata. It cannot by way of reforms become an autonomous, socially determining power, since such reforms would be identical with the destruction of Capital. If it wants to become autonomous, it can do this at best only as in Russia, along revolutionary paths. The existence of the present-day russian bureaucracy presupposed the expropriation of the former capitalists. The expropriation of Capital in backward countries can lead, within the framework of world capitalism, only to state capitalism. In highly developed capitalist countries, however, any revolution is of necessity a worker's revolution. It can not find its limits in state capitalism, since this is incapable of setting aside even temporarily the causes by which the revolution was brought about. If the workers have rebelled against capitalism, so they must also of necessity rebel against the state capitalism which likewise is incapable of improving their situation.

The revolution of the workers is of necessity the permanent revolution until <u>every</u> capitalistic relation is set aside. It is only in the wake of a workers' revolution that a complete state capitalism in highly developed countries is conceivable; but this apparent possibility is at the same time precluded because for such countries it would be equivalent to a step backward which isbound to make of any attempt at state capitalism a quickly passing adventure. Since here the complete state capitalism is objectively not possible, any fascist revolution is bound to stop with the complete subordination of the State to the interests of monopoly capital. The next step, the expropriation of capital, is fatal also to any other form of capitalistic exploitation. The State as State, not the intellectualist State, has today in capitalist countries the political instruments of power in its hands. The State has more economic authority, more influence upon the economy in fascist than in democratic countries, because in the fascist countries monopoly capital was compelled to proceed more aggressively against all other capitals and strata of the population in order to maintain the capitalist system at all. Here, Capital and State tend more and more to merge with each other; that

is, Capital directs the State just as it does its own office employees. It is only in Russia that the State is the owner of the means of production; but here also- to repeat--there is no more trace of intellectualist domination than in the capitalist countries.

The only assertion that Nomad is justified in making on this point is that the russian state bureaucracy rules in Russia. What he might consider is this: whether similar conditions may take form in other countries; that is, whether bolshevist revolutions are possible in industrially developed countries, or whether the truth is not rather that here the last possible capitalist modification has been accomplished with fascist monopoly capitalism.

It is commonly assumed that the backwardness of Russia is responsible for the difficulties and the round-about course of its "socialism". We assert that by virtue of these difficulties and this backwardness socialism within the framework of world capitalism is quite precluded, and that a leap from semi-feudal conditions into socialism is possible only under world-revolutionary conditions.

Still, we assert at the same time that it is precisely the backwardness of the russian economy which is the secret of the bolshevist success and of the carrying thru of the russian state capitalism, that without this backwardness neither would have been possible.

The state-capitalist chatter of Bismarck's to which Nomad has referred, the state-capitalist foundations of Turkey, the state-capitalist tendencies coming to light more clearly in Italy than in Germany, the bolshevist character of the chinese revolution,--these things speak a clear language. They denote, that is, that a capitalist development in backward countries within the existing imperialistic milieu is possible only as a hot-house growth, that it cannot take the "normal" course of capitalist development. A national capitalist unfoldment more or less independent of international monopolist-imperialistic capital is possible only with the greatest attainable concentration and centralization of all economic and political instruments of power: the thing that for "normal" capitalist development appears as a result is here a necessary presupposition. If the greatest possible concentration of capitals and the unification of imperialistic endeavor is a necessary matter-of-course for all capitalist countries within the framework of international competition, it must today be much more necessary for those backward countries struggling much harder for their existence. If Russia, for example, did not wish to share the fate of the semi-colonies, if it wanted to become a world power on its own account, or

even to assure its independence, it was not free to take the normal path of capitalist development. Russian capitalism in that case could not, like the english, german or american capitalism, whose development extended over centuries or several generations, arrive at concentration by way of competition, but was obliged to overleap by political means the laissez-faire period. Not only was Russia obliged to do this, but was also able to do so, because she was able to begin with those productive methods with which the progressive unfoldment of capital in highly developed countries had ended.

When the Bolsheviks came to power, they had no intention of expropriating industrial capital. They demanded no more than control of production. By way of credit control, foreign trade monopoly, transport monopoly, etc., they thought they could direct the capitalist movement by means of the state authority. The expropriation of the capitalists by the workers without the consent of the Bolsheviks, the resistance of the capitalists speculating upon a defeat of the Bolsheviks, forced the party to take up the nationalization of all industry. The state, i.e., the bureaucracy of the Bolshevist Party, thus became the total capitalist. The slow disruption of all extra-bureaucratic centers of power, of the open and concealed capitalist opposition and the emasculation of the soviets soon provided it with the possibility of fulfilling the capitalistic functions as well as those of suppression. Practically, however, this was possible only because of the relative weakness of Capital, and hence of the proletariat, as well as the backwardness of the peasant masses who were not in a position themselves to represent their interests permanently through taking over the powers of government. The Bolsheviks maintained themselves in power by means of a systematic playing off of the workers' interests against those of the peasants, and vice versa. The weakness of all the various classes enabled and rendered necessary a governing bureaucracy which, thru skillful tacking and balancing of the various interests, could make itself more and more autonomous. The repetition of this process in other countries presupposes similar situations, which, however, are not present in any capitalistically developed country.

The russian "neo-feudal" situation is bound up with backward conditions, and as a matter of fact it is only in backward countries that similar endeavors are present, while in highly developed countries the bolshevist influence has slowly receded and is today almost completely eliminated. If, as Nomad fears, the russian example should be repeated in capitalist countries, an historical retrogression would have to be possible. And it is

probably for this reason that Nomad says, in the previously mentioned article in Scribner's, that state capitalism "may be brought into existence in the wake of a fascist victory accompanied by a cultural plunge into the dark ages" (p. 441). Apart from the fancifulness of the idea that no other than the intellectuals should lead us into cultural barbarism, i.e., into a state of affairs which necessarily makes the intellectuals superfluous, the fate of state-capitalist "dreamers" like Schleicher and Roehm in Germany has surely shown that neither the german capitalists nor the german intellectuals are inclined or in a position to turn history backward and bring about a state-capitalist economy. State capitalism is not an indication of new capitalist life, but a sign of its weakness. These tendencies stand at the beginning and at the end of capitalism, at the two weak points of its development. State capitalism is not a higher stage of the capitalist expansion, but only one of the many manifestations of capitalism, which in all its manifestations must go under. For all these manifestations contain in themselves the contradiction between productive forces and production relations.

V.

With the development of the division of labor as a means to, and expression of, the increasing social forces of production, labor was rendered both simpler and more difficult. At the same time that skilled labor was acquiring greater importance in the social process of production, it simplified the labor process as well; and the more concern was devoted to this latter consideration, the greater was the demand for skilled labor. In spite and even because of all the specialization, the importance of skilled labor has increased.

The division of labor as accelerated by capitalism has constantly deepened the cleft between intellectual labor and manual. This contradiction is visible not only in production, but in all the spheres of social life. Intellectual activity learned to overlook the close connection with the practical activity of society; theory and practice, which in reality are inseparable, were looked upon as separate both by theoreticians and practicians. The intellectuals reproduced themselves as intellectuals, the workers as workers; the apparent autonomousness of each group was increasingly recognized as a fact. The thought that there would always be intellectuals appeared quite as obvious as the thought that there must also always be people on hand to do the dirty work.

Practice appears here as a product of theory, tho both can only exist together; and this false appearance en-

abled the theoreticians to regard themselves as the salt of the earth, while they looked upon the workers as constituting nothing more than the material with which they worked. The intellectuals saw themselves as the essential and decisive group of society; a group which, to be sure, was conditioned by Capital, but Capital also appeared to them merely as an intellectual creation.

Capitalism developed the productive forces of society, in enormous measure. This development is the secret of the progress in science and hence also of the increasing importance of the intellectuals. Now that capitalism is in course of stagnation, its science also is bound to stagnate; with the decline of capitalism is bound up also the decline of its science and thereby of its intellectuals. It is only because the development of the productive forces is not dependent on any one particular form of society that the intellectuals as well as science may be said to stand "above the classes". In a new society science loses--and with it the intellectuals lose--those characteristics which were valid only for capitalist society.

One cannot judge from the attitude of the present-day intellectuals as to the attitude of those people by whom the intellectual functions will be performed tomorrow. Nor can the present human egoism, which necessarily has to assert itself individually, be regarded as the manner in which egoism is to be expressed for all eternity; there is also an egoism which can find satisfaction only in work in common. But if the ideological attitude of the present-day intellectuals throws no light on the further development, still a great number of insights can be won thru consideration of their economic necessities and the change of the economic relations themselves.

Within the capitalist decline, a part of the intellectuals also is bound to go under. The competition among them is growing more intense; they are losing the possibility of reproducing themselves; their economic situation grows worse of necessity. The reaction to this state of affaird--a reaction strengthened by way of the intensified competitive struggle for the vanishing positions--can only be the overrating of their own importance. One does not shield himself against death by committing suicide, but by the strengthening of his vital energies. The narrower the life of the intellectuals becomes, the more persistently will they attempt to demonstrate to society the necessity of their existence. They have to become reactionary in order to live, and in this way are themselves obliged to contribute to still further undermining the social position which they have hitherto occupied.

If the capitalistic intellectual is not in a position to go forward, because capitalism is going under, so also the intellectuals cease to be the exponents of science. If the proletarian class alone is in a position to drive forward the social forces of production along revolutionary paths, it has thereby also become the bearer of science, and the intellectuals are obliged to operate within the framework of the communist system. With the setting aside of the class relations, there vanish also the sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions. The reproduction of the functionally different labor powers is no longer individually determined, but socially.

Without economic equality, there is no communist society. This equality must not only be actually possible, it must also be capable of driving forward the productive forces of society, and until that time communism is quite out of the question. But if communism is bound up with the presence of equality, then it is also beyond doubt that this equality will be actualized; for the social forces of production are impelling to communism, and this impulsion is the historically determining factor.

The distinctions between skilled and simple labor can be abolished or modified only thru improvement of the general labor level. The changeable estimation of the various labor qualifications has obliterated the fact that the distinction between skilled and unskilled labor is growing less sharp. The mass of the workers has become skilled workers, notwithstanding that their labor is rated as primitive; it is miles removed from the primitive labor of the period of manufacture.

Apart from exceptions the number of which is constantly growing less and which socially do not count, the demands placed on that element of the population performing intellectual functions are no higher than those placed on the mass of the workers; they are merely different. The division of labor has also affected in very large measure the intellectual functions, without lowering the level of the intellectuals themselves. Even today the great mass of the intellectuals represents approximately the average intelligence. The fact that in certain industries a single manipulation constitutes the worker's entire activity does not place him outside the society for which the manipulation by no means represents the state of labor technique. The general qualifications have improved and have brought with them an unmistakable tendency to standardization. Still more rapidly than the intellecuals were able to cultivate their special qualities there came about an elevation of training as a whole. This process may be held up temporarily, but after all it is destined again and

again to assert itself. A development in the opposite direction, the permanent proletarian helotism, would preclude the possibility of communism, but then also the possibility of capitalism--in fact, any possibility whatever of social life, since retrogression means death.

The intellectuals have no economic functions. Capitalist economy is not finally subject to human will, but is determined "extra-humanly"; commodity fetishism rules. The intellectuals have only technical and ideological functions to perform for capitalism; their capacities stand in no real connection with the social economy. They have no more to offer communism than have the workers. They know no more about the social laws of motion than do the workers. When they are interested in a social change, they wish to bring it about from the side of consciousness. But there is no social consciousness, and so in their theories they arrive no farther than at state capitalism, which compels to dictatorship over the workers. They want to organize society in the same way that one organizes a factory, a monopoly, a university; that is, in precisely the same manner that organizing is done even today.

Nor do the workers know much more. They need only to know that they themselves are not the masters in the social projects conceived by the intellectuals. If they do not know it, they cannot help learning it; for their material distress, however often they may leave its abolition to others, can never by others be even so much as mitigated. There remains to the workers in the last instance nothing but to take charge, themselves, of the social organization. The thing that to them alone is possible is also at the same time the only way out of poverty and crisis.

The capitalist decline compels capitalistic terrorism. If capital can no longer progressively grow, it is obliged, in order to maintain itself, to proceed to the absolute impoverishment of the great masses of the population, and this makes the permanent terrorism necessary . The terrorism precludes political activity on the part of the less pauperized elements of the population; the future lies in the insurrections of the most impoverished. A great measure of actual poverty leads to spontaneous uprisings, which, by reason of the existing terrorism, can also have only spontaneously formed leaderships. The necessarily spontaneous character of the insurrections as well as their scope, which must be an enormous one in order to make the insurrections at all possible, restrict the participation in them of the intellectuals not yet proletarized. The revolutionary mass is left to itself.

It can either be defeated in order later to break forth anew, since it can not be exterminated, or it can win the victory over Capital and take possession of the means of production. Under the circumstances described, the workers are assembled in masses only in the industrial enterprises. The industrial enterprise is the starting point of their insurrections and the natural basis of their dictatorship and efforts at social reorganization. The workers have no interest in inequality; they want no one over themselves, and they have no one under them, for they were the lowest stratum of society. They will be obliged, in the interest of a frictionless process of production subject to their control, to have recourse to equal "remuneration". Unequal "remuneration" is always an indication that the workers themselves do not rule, but are ruled. The workers are the only persons who can take up with this equal remuneration as a social necessity, and they will be obliged to devise economic methods to the end that this equality may be assured. For a communist society, there is only one measure of estimation, the natural one. Just as the machines are looked upon only as machines, as use values, so also must the necessary "measure of value" for the production of use objects be a natural one--the labor time. The social character of labor compels to the acceptance of the average labor time as the computing unit and as the general social measure of value. The social average labor hour precludes economic inequality. There is no communism without such a socially valid measure of value by which the society is impersonally conducted. There is no release from working-class distress without communism. The struggle will be waged until the socialization is actually carried out by way of society. With equal "remuneration" is bound up the social reproduction of labor power. Each form of labor is open to everyone; the particular function which a person performs in the social labor process is henceforth actually just a matter of the person's individual capacity. This fact, entering into the individual's consciousness, is the assurance of a relatively frictionless acceptance of the division of labor. The shortening of labor time, henceforth possible, enables the whole labor problem in general to become one of secondary importance; people will learn to take the performance of their social function as a matter of course in the same way that at the present time they brush their teeth.

But we are not so much interested here in what will be done under the new society; we are here concerned merely with emphasizing that the present-day working class is quite in a position, without and if necessary against the intellectuals, to make their revolution and to build up the new society. This state of things is in itself a sufficient guarantee that the intellectuals, in their

own vital interest, will take their places in the new society and under the conditions of this society. This is not the place for going further into the laws of motion of a communist society; it might be stated, however, that if Nomad had concerned himself more with these laws, he would have realized that the whole problem of the intellectuals is one of subordinate importance,--that the matter of much greater moment is to make it clear to the working class that even today it is in a position to build a real communist society and that any difficulties which may be occasioned by the intellectuals may be dealt with in the framework of the proletarian dictatorship.

- P. M. -

::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::

NOTICE

Max Nomad will reply to this article in the next issue of the Council Correspondence.

.....

Forthcoming articles in the Council Correspondence:

German Imperialism
Marx and Lenin on the State
Bolshevism in Spain?
The Council Movement in England
Planned Economy Nonsense in the Labor Movement
Competition and Average Rate of Profit

.....

Send in your subscription today for the Council Correspondence.

1604 N. California Ave.,
Chicago, Ill.

::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::

::::::::::::::::::::

::::::::::::

:::::

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Defeat in France

Luxemburg Versus Lenin

On the Accumulation of Capital

The Factor of Spontaneity

The Question of Organization

The Role of Fascism

Vol. II **No. 8**

JULY 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

own vital interest, will take their places in the new society and under the conditions of this society. This is not the place for going further into the laws of motion of a communist society; it might be stated, however, that if Nomad had concerned himself more with these laws, he would have realized that the whole problem of the intellectuals is one of subordinate importance,--that the matter of much greater moment is to make it clear to the working class that even today it is in a position to build a real communist society and that any difficulties which may be occasioned by the intellectuals may be dealt with in the framework of the proletarian dictatorship.

- P. M. -

::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::

NOTICE

Max Nomad will reply to this article in the next issue of the Council Correspondence.

.....

Forthcoming articles in the Council Correspondence:

German Imperialism
Marx and Lenin on the State
Bolshevism in Spain?
The Council Movement in England
Planned Economy Nonsense in the Labor Movement
Competition and Average Rate of Profit

.....

Send in your subscription today for the Council Correspondence.

1604 N. California Ave.,
Chicago, Ill.

.....

::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::

:::::::::::::::::::::

:::::::::::::

:::::

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Defeat in France

Luxemburg Versus Lenin

On the Accumulation of Capital

The Factor of Spontaneity

The Question of Organization

The Role of Fascism

Vol. II **No. 8**

JULY 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

∴ Published at 1604 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois ∴

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

THE DEFEAT IN FRANCE.

There are defeats which are victories, and victories behind which lurks defeat. The victory of the "Popular Front" in France and the victory of the strikers are victories only in form. Behind the triumphal shout of the bureaucratic labor movement is concealed the fact that the revolutionary energy of the french proletariat has been squandered to no purpose. As a matter of fact, the french workers have suffered the first decisive defeat in the struggle against Capital.

France was drawn into the world crisis relatively late. Since 1933, however, the economic conditions have constantly grown worse. The index of production (on the basis of 100 for the year 1929) amounted to 76.7 in 1933; 71 in 1934; 67.4 in 1935; and 70.2 in 1936 (january-February). This stagnation is identical with the increasing impoverishment of the workers. In March 1936 the number of registered unemployed already amounted to 465,000. The deflationist policy of the government reduced wages and salaries more rapidly than domestic prices. The situation of the proletariat has become less and less tolerable and for a long while has resulted in an intensification of ill-humor which has now been discharged in the great wave of strikes.

Circumstances of foreign policy led to the conclusion of the franco-russian military pact. The nearness of the war danger made it necessary to speed up the ideological preparation of the masses. To this end, in view of the fact that french Fascism lacked a mass basis, owing to the relative retardation of the economic crisis in France, the french bourgeoisie was compelled to cast its eyes upon the labor parties. It seemed politically not inappropriate, or for the moment unavoidable, in the opinion of this bourgeoisie, to engage the labor organizations directly for its own purposes and to hold their fascist forces in reserve. At any rate, it did nothing to prevent or make impossible the parliamentary victory of the "Popular Front".

Because of the alliance with Russia, anti-Bolshevism was unpopular. The attitude of the french "communists", who in supporting the People's Front came out for a "strong, free and happy" France, the transformation of the Third International into the best defender of capitalist interests, and the momentary war value of the slogan of struggle of "democratic" against fascist countries,--these things raised the agitational value of the election slogans of the popular-front parties and stood in the way of the fascist propaganda. The united-front enthusiasm--that is, the fact that the Communist Party made itself the tail end of the Social Democracy--was likewise a propagandistic asset, which led to such repulsive results as the fraternization of the communists with officers of the french army. The communist parliamentarians gave their approval to increased military expenditures; their demands were in many cases still more reactionary than those of the Social Democracy, since the "communists" are still more interested than the socialists in the strengthening of the french fatherland. The communists now have two fatherlands to defend, while the socialists still like to content themselves with only one. And so the communists had more at stake than the socialists in a popular movement as broad as possible, and which went the whole length of communist offers to the fascists with a view to these latter joining the patriotic Front. As regards the social democrats, they want to govern only for their own bourgeoisie.

The labor parties have won in France with a facsist program. They were still more national than the fascists, and their economic program, which restricted itself to attacking "200 families"--that is, the stock holders of the Bank of France--and otherwise to stealing from Roosevelt's NRA anything available, was not very far removed from the fascist swindle in this respect. All that is nothing for any worker to get excited about, for such a program and such feats involve nothing in any way

original. In the present circumstances, the whole of the old labor movement is compelled, if it wants to maintain itself, to take up fascist slogans and to compete with the fascists for the honor of being able to govern for Capital.

Under these conditions the union between SP and CP is at the same time nothing more than a business connection. The SP was ready to aid in supporting, by the side of its own state capitalism, also that of the Russians. The struggle against Fascism is actually and loyally being conducted by these groups, so far as the thing is possible to the valets of Capital. In the first place, this "anti-fascist" struggle serves merely to veil the eventual conflict between imperialist groups of powers, the securing of french against german capital; for so long as the french bourgeoisie is obliged to fear german capital, the labor movement must be opposed to german fascism. There is also the fact that these labor leaders are conducting their anti-fascist struggle in their own interests: one bureaucracy is fighting against another bureaucracy. But at the same time, they conduct their struggle against Fascism constantly in the interest of Capital, which is capable of existing under the most various forms of government.

The french socialists with 146 deputies in the new Chamber have taken over the government for french capital. They are supported by the bourgeois-democratic "Radical Socialists" and covered in very large measure by the communists with 72 deputies and by a number of small splinter groups, without for the present participating in the government. The program of the new government is, like the electoral program, directed first against Fascism; which is only natural, as every government has to shake off the competition. Furthermore, it combats the war danger, and here too, of course, as in all other countries, thru the strengthening of the military capacities, for only one who is heavily armed can live in peace. Within the framework of the arming policy, the government's demands for nationalization of the armament industry are likewise quite natural, just as all the other "planned-economy factors" of the "socialization program" here acquire their deeper meaning. Practically, however, they are of less significance than they pretend: the war economy would of course automatically render necessary the centralization of power to determine all phases of social life. But even without war, this "planned economy" serves practically only to promote the interests of the capitalist strata which are favored even today and is an expression of the advancing concentration of capital.

A number of other trick demands is represented by the

new government; for example, it proposes to combat the influence of big capital upon politics, press and public finances. Such phrases are designed to please the petty bourgeois, but the reality which they conceal is something quite different. The people who set this demand on the order of the day are practically condemned to be the executive organ of big capital, and their role is accordingly reduced to that of voluntarily stultifying themselves. The rest of the government demands, such as a better credit policy, public works, etc., are all taken from the rooseveltian "socialism", the practical value of which has been clearly demonstrated in America the last few years. These policies have strengthened the power of monopoly capital, and nothing more. The baits thrown to the workers, such as collective contracts, eight-hour day, legislative sanction for competence to negotiate regarding rates of pay, etc., have already shown their insignificance in Germany, and no other fate is reserved for the french reformery. It is not politics which determines the economy; politics is only a part of profit production. The economy remains, as Leon Blum himself says, capitalistic; and capitalistic also remain its solutions of crisis. No crisis under capitalism can be solved except thru the sharpening of exploitation and the deepening of proletarian misery. The reform demands in the interest of the french workers, if put thru, would necessarily deepen the crisis and the deepening of the crisis would lead to the setting aside of the reforms. In a word: under capitalism in decline, reformism becomes objectively impossible. Anyone who contests this is a charlatan and has all the facts against him. One has only to glance at the fate of social reforms in the other countries. Serious struggle against impoverishment--a struggle which can be conducted only outside of parliaments--could at most compel Capital, if it wants to evade a decisive struggle with the workers, to change the <u>methods</u> of impoverishment; even Capital cannot affect the <u>process</u> of impoverishment. It is possible, for example, to the end of robbing and more sharply exploiting the masses, to make use of inflationist instead of deflationist methods; instead of cutting wages, the prices can be correspondingly raised. One and the same goal can be reached directly or indirectly, by straight or crooked paths. The working day can be shortened,and at the same time the thing can be made profitable by making the labor process more intense.

However, the incapacity of Capital to better the situation of the workers is also its problem. This problem may indeed cause the "labor leaders", in their desire to "understand both sides", many a headache, but the working class remains unphased. As little as Capital can voluntarily renounce an ever sharpened exploitation

of the proletariat, so little can the proletariat desist from uninterrupted struggle against impoverishment. Neither class moves as a result of understanding of its own or the general situation, but the acts of both classes are forced upon them thru the unregulated capitalist market mechanism. It is the task of the government, by means of force and cunning, to keep these two opposed tendencies within bounds which assure the perpetuity of exploitation society.

If the workers succeed in holding their position against Capital, the latter is obliged to oppress so much the more the other weaker strata of society,--the farmers, the middle class and the smaller capitals. The workers' resistance to pauperization can only lead to promoting the general pauperization. In this sense,the workers' resistance, without being capable of doing away with impoverishment, is of enormous revolutionary importance. It sharpens all the capitalist contradictions, and compels to constantly more accelerated impoverishment of ever broader strata. At a certain point of the development, the burden of impoverishment can no longer be divided at will among the various social strata, and the leveling process of impoverishment has come to a close. Then is reached the absolute and of all reformist policy. Until that time, the burdens of the permanent crisis may frequently still be shifted from one stratum of society to the other, but no one is in a position to help all strata of society at the same time. If the popular-front parties want to assure themselves of the middle class, they must be willing to worsen the situation of the workers. If they want to keep the confidence of the workers, then the other strata of society must be attacked. There is only the one thing to be done or the other. If the popular-front parties proceed against the middle class (and so in part against themselves,) they will only raise up Fascism, which will then have no choice but to combine with its enemy, monopoly capital, against the workers. If they spare the middle class, then they lose influence among the workers and thereby the support of Capital. They will be thrown out as unserviceable, their "life's work" will flow into the pockets of the fascists, who will take over the "inheritance" of the labor fakers. Only one thing is beyond the power both of the fascists and of the labor parties: they cannot attack big capital, for any damage to the interests of big capital sharpens the crisis and brings into question the whole of capitalist society. The weight of big capital within present society is too great to be experimented with. The society of today lives and dies with the fortunes of big capital, which has to be profitable in order to be at all. In order to attack big capital, capitalist society has to be overthrown; but

the overthrow of capitalist society is not in harmony with the interests of the labor organizations at work today, nor with those of the Blum government.

The time is past in which the fight for reforms could be conducted in any but a revolutionary way. But with this, reform also ceases to be the goal of its champions. The workers may think that they are fighting for reforms; if they wish, however, to put them thru, they are obliged to overthrow Capital. Once this is done, however, the reform no longer matters, for society itself is then mastered. And so the professional reformists have no choice but to turn against reforms. Their propaganda in favor of reforms becomes a swindle; practically, the propagandists themselves are fighting against them.

Any real change of the workers' situation under the present conditions, and increasingly also in France, means eventually civil war. In such a war, all capitalist interests, hence also the present-day labor parties, will automatically line up against the revolutionary workers. The only activity which in the meantime remains to the reformists is deception: they promise without themselves intending that the promises shall be kept. In this way the workers can for longer or shorter periods be held in leash, and in return the reformists are for the same length of time tolerated by the bourgeoisie. No group is today capable of representing more than its direct and immediate interests. No one can adopt a policy for long in advance. A policy often has the appearance of being planned, but that is not really so; it is only that in this case, quite accidentally, direct interests coincide with some which have a farther reach. With every step which Capital takes in order to satisfy its direct interests, it makes itself, from the historical standpoint, at the same time more impossible. But it cannot do otherwise; if it refrained from taking the step because it realized the eventual consequences, it would still go under. And so it can live only for the moment. And the matter is similar as regards the labor organization. The realization that it is impossible to deceive indefinitely, and so that at last they will be driven out, does not affect the momentary compulsion to deceive in order to exist at all.

The Popular Front, as well as the Blum government, can only deceive the masses, and will drive them more and more away from itself and into the arms of the fascists. The large middle class existing in France, and which everywhere forms the backbone of Fascism, will lend still more impulsion to the accelerated fascization. In the process of disappointment awaiting the masses, class solidarity is at the same time more and more disintegrated.

The workers are then just as willing to take a chance with the fascists as they had done unsuccessfully with the radicals. These latter are then not in a position to incite the masses to resistance against the fascists; they have served their time.

The concrete experience of all that was had in Germany. The same process is being repeated today in France; for the old labor movement refuses to learn, refuses to draw from the german experience the corresponding conclusions for France. It is bound to capitalism, and so is obliged, if it wants to live, to prepare the way for Fascism, even tho this latter will finally be its death.

The popular-front government can do no damage to the french bourgeoisie. Its only damage will be to the workers. The popular-front government is the government of french capital. There is no fear, as a catholic academician writes in Figaro, that Leon Blum will be the master, but rather that he will not be master enough. If the Blum government fails to hold the french workers in check, if it fails to raise the profitability of capital, if it fails to govern sufficiently against the people,then it will be thrown out. The new government has to demonstrate that it is the best bulwark against the french workers. When it proceeds against the workers, it merely defends its own existence. Anyone who is for the popular-front government is against the workers and on the way to "Noske-socialism": someone must of course be the bloodhound.

Long before the accession of the Blum government, strike sentiment prevailed among the french workers. Encouraged by the victory of the Popular Front, certain that the new government was not in a position to bring the soldiery into action against them forthwith, the workers began their long-delayed strike. As a matter of fact,the Blum government was not in a position to come out openly against the strikers, as likewise the trade-union organizations were forced to accept the strike under the pressure of mass sentiment. The government considered it best to wait and leave the strangling of the strike to the professional labor leaders. The communists made themselves phraseologically even "the spearhead of the strikers", tho only in order to blunt its point. The enemy sat among the strikers themselves; their leaders were for the most part also their conscious and unconscious strike-breakers. The strike movement also helped the government somewhat in finding a parliamentary home for its NRA-swindle, and thus increased its prestige, for the government succeeded at the same time in making the strikes futile. Parliamentary action was directed against the strike, which it restricted in its development and deprived of its aggressive character. Instead

of bread, there were new laws which, apart from the ink, cost nothing. Laws which, even if they are literally complied with, are incapable of making any essential change in the situation of the proletariat. Frequently the strike seemed to get out of the hands of the labor leaders. It was hard to master and control because of its extension. This was at the same time its centralization, but without the experienced central committee, so that the strike had great force behind it. The syndicalist elements of the labor movement had also little reason to care for the apprehensions of the government, and their self-initiative made control still more difficult and at the same time prevented a violent intervention on the part of the government. The scope of the strike might have spoiled the career of the government at the very beginning, if it had come to a test of strength with the strikers. The best course was to harangue the strikers and throttle the strike by way of sympathy. The government forces gradually succeeded in breaking up the strike front and so in bringing the strike to a dreary end. The popular-front government thus had behind it its first betrayal of the workers; for the gains of the strike are paper ones, not real. The government's deception was praised by the communists as "cool-headedness and self-control of the workers." Enthusiastically they wrote: "The flood is mastering itself."

The remarkable thing about the strike was the tactic employed by the workers, that of remaining in the enterprises. As the first large-scale violation of the ideology of private property, this fact is of incalculable value to the entire working class. The occupancy of the enterprises leads on quite naturally to the direction of strikes by the workers themselves. The possibility of influence from the outside becomes more difficult; the spirit of solidarity grows stronger. From this point to the councils there is only a short step. The fact that the workers are going over more and more on their own initiative to occupying the enterprises will also compel the old labor organizations more and more to combat strikes which they are unable to control. The militancy of the workers unveils at the same time the treacherous character of the old labor movement. The old labor movement and the popular-front government will be compelled in their own interests to proceed against the workers in such a vile manner that at the same time they will hasten the process of digging their own grave.

Once the power of the strike was broken, the Blum government proceeded promptly to turn from the friendly phrase and take up the brutal suppression of the workers. The government began its struggle against "Right

and Left". Newspapers of the left CP-Opposition and other groups not in agreement with the ruling labor parties were forbidden, strikers arrested and thrown into jail. Laws are being prepared which are designed to hit all enemies of the present government, hence also the revolutionary workers turning against the betrayal perpetrated by the Blum government.

However, the masses of the workers are still pursuing the false hopes which they have set on the Popular-Front and their government. They will be bitterly disappointed. Once the government has become more firmly consolidated, if they should try again with their own weapon, the strike, to represent their interests, the Blum government will not be in a position to answer the call for bread with paper laws; for the laws cannot be made twice, and in spite of the laws the masses will slowly famish more and more. They will learn to thumb their noses at all constitutions and laws and, in the lack of sufficient class force, which today is being still more disintegrated by the old labor movement, they will flock to Fascism. Anyone who wants to fight against Fascism must today fight against Blum and the Popular Front. He must pronounce the truth that the french "victory" is in reality the beginning of a whole series of defeats. The workers are on the wrong path; with Blum and Thorez, they are marching straight into Fascism.

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

NOTICE

Max Nomad's reply to the article "Dictatorship of the Intellectuals ?", appearing in the last issue of the C.C., did not arrive early enough to be included in this issue. It will appear in the August issue of the C.C. The next issue will contain also an extensive report from Palestine under the title:

THE LAND OF PROMISE

and other interesting articles.

.....

THE ROLE OF FASCISM

The chief characteristic of fascism is that of organizing the petty capitalist and middle class with their narrow-minded spirit of private business into a mass organization, strong enough to check and beat the proletarian organizations. This class, squeezed in between the capitalist and the working class, unable to fight capitalism, is always ready to turn against the workers' class struggle. Tho it hates big capital and puts forth anti-capitalistic slogans, it is a tool in the hands of capitalism, which pays and directs its political action towards the subduing of the workers.

Its ideas and theories are directed chiefly against the class struggle, against the workers feeling and acting as a separate class. Against this, it brings forward a strong nationalistic feeling, the idea of the unity of the nation against foreign nations. In this nation workers have their place, not as a separate class, but combined with the employers as industrial and agrarian groups of production. Representatives of these groups form advisory boards for the government. This is called the Corporative State, founded on direct representation of the economic grouping of society, on capitalist labor. It is opposed to the parliamentary system for which fascism has hardly any use and which it denounces as a power of disruption, a mischievous preaching of internal dissension.

Parliamentarism is the expression of supremacy of the people, the citizens, and of the dependence of the government. Fascism puts the State above the citizens. The State, as organization of the nation, is the superior objective to which the citizens are subordinate. Not democracy, not the people's right, but authority, the people's duties stand first. It places the party chief at the head of the State, as a dictator, to rule with his party companions without interference from parliamentary delegates.

It is clear that this form of government corresponds to the needs of modern capitalism. In a highly developed capitalism economic power is not rooted, as it was in the beginning, in a numerous class of independent producers, but in a small group of big capitalists. Their interests can be served better by influencing a small body of absolute rulers, and their operations seem more

safely secured if all opposition of the workers and all public criticism is kept down with an iron fist. Hence a tendency is visible in all countries to increase the power of the central government and of the chieftains of the State. Tho this is also sometimes called fascism, it makes some difference whether parliamentary control is maintained, or an open dictatorial rule is established, founded upon the terrorism of a mighty party organization.

In Germany an analogous development of the national-socialist movement took place somewhat later. The revolution of 1918 had brought socialism into power but this power was made use of to protect capitalism. The socialists in the government let the capitalists operate as they liked. The petty capitalist classes seeing their antagonists on both sides now united and socialist officials involved in foul capitalist affairs considered socialist state concern and capitalist speculation as one common principle of corruption of an international gang of grafters. It opposed to them the honest small business of petty capitalists and the conservative old-time farmers. Young intellectuals of the universities who found their former monopoly of public offices infringed upon by detested socialist leaders, and former officers jobless thru the diminuation of the army, organized the first groups of national-socialists.

They were eager nationalists because they belonged to the capitalist middle classes and were opposed to the internationalism of the ruling social-democracy. They called themselves socialist, because their petty-capitalistic feeling was hostile to big business and big finance. They were strongly anti-Semitic, too. Firstly, because Jewish capital played an important role in Germany especially in the large stores, which stores caused the ruin of the small shopkeepers. Secondly, because numerous Jewish intellectuals flooded the universities and the learned professions, and by their keener wits often -- e.g. as lawyers and physicians -- left their German competitors behind them.

Financially these national-socialists were backed by many big capitalist concerns, especially by the armament industry which felt its interests endangered by the increasing disarmament conferences. They formed the illegal fighting groups of capitalism against rising Bolshevism. Then came the world crisis, aggravating the conditions in Germany exhausted as it was by the peace treaty indemnities. The revolt of the desperate middle classes raised the National-Socialist Party to the position of the mightiest party and enabled it to seize the political power and to make its leader the dictator of Germany.

Seemingly this dictatorship of middle class ideas is directed against big capitalism as well as against the working class movement. It is clear, however, that a petty capitalist program of a return to former times of small business cannot be carried out. It soon became evident in Germany that big capitalism and the land-owning aristocracy are still the real masters behind the ruling National-Socialist Party. In reality this party acts as an instrument of capitalism to fight and destroy the workers' organization.

So strong was the power of the new slogans that they drew even a large number of workers with them, who joined the National-Socialist Party. The workers had learned to follow their leaders, but these leaders having disappointed them, were beaten by the stronger leaders. The splendour and the spiritual power of the socialist and communist ideals had waned. National-socialism promised the workers a better socialism, by class-peace instead of by class-war. If offered them their appropriate place in the nation as members of the united people not as a separate class.

Due to the victory of Fascism, or its equivalent, in certain countries, the working classes in these countries have been thrown back in their systematic upward strife for liberation. Their organizations have been wiped out, or in the case of the trade unions, put directly under the command of capitalist state officials. The workers' papers have been suppressed, free speech prohibited, socialist and communist propaganda forbidden and punished with imprisonment, concentration camps or long incarceration. In the enforced uniformity of opinion there is no room for revolutionary teachings. The way of regular progress towards proletarian power in the development of insight and organization by means of propaganda and discussions, the way to revolution and freedom, is blocked by the concrete wall of reaction.

So it appears on the surface. But, looking deeper into the problem, it only means that for the workers the smooth and peaceful way of growing to power is blocked. We said before that the right of free speech, the right of organizing, the right of propaganda and of forming political parties, were necessary for capitalism. It means that they are necessary to ensure a regular working of capitalist production and capitalist development. It means that, once they are gone, the class antagonisms must at last explode in heavy uprisings and violent revolutionary movements. The capitalist class has to decide whether it prefers this way.

It has its reasons for taking this way. It strongly feels that the heavy world crisis of today is shaking

the capitalist system in the heart. It knows that the diminished production is unable to feed the whole working class and at the same time to leave sufficient profits. It is resolved not to bear the losses itself. So it realizes that the workers, starved by unemployment, must rise and will rise in revolts. And it tries to forestall them by fortifying its own position, by forging the whole capitalist class into one strong unity,by putting the state power in strong armor, by tying the workers to this state by means of strong fetters, by robbing them of their old means of defense, their socialist spokesmen and their organizations. This is the reason why in these last years fascism became powerful.

Capitalism at one time seemed to be on to the best way of fooling the workers by means of sham-democracy and sham-reforms. Now it is turning the other way, to heavy oppression. This must drive the workers to resistence and to determined class fighting. Why does capitalism do so? Not of its own free will, but compelled by material, economic forces inherent in itd innermost nature; by the heavy crisis which endangers its profits and arouses its fears for revolution.

Triumphant fascism boasts that it has blocked the way to communism forever. Its claim for this is because it has crushed the workers' movement. What it really crushed were only the ineffective, primitive forms. It destroyed the illusions, the old socialist beliefs,the socialist and communist parties -- all obsolete things hampering progress. It destroyed at the same time the old party divisions which incited workers against workers. It thereby has restored their natural class unity.

Parties are groups of common opinion; organizations are dependent on membership--both of these are secondary accidentals. Class is the primary reality founded in the nature of capitalism itself. By tradition the workers considered political opinion and organization membership as the real distinctions between workers and capitalists. They were thinking and feeling in terms of parties and unions--and by tradition may continue to do so for some time. Now they are constrained to think and feel in terms of class. Without any walls of partition, they stand one beside the other and they see that they are all comrades, subject to the same capitalist exploitation. No party discipline can call them to action;they will have to think out and make their own action when the burden of Fascist capitalism makes itself too heavily felt. The mist of opposing party opinions, of political slogans, of union narrowness, which dimmed the natural class consciousness, has been destroyed. Sharp and relentless the reality of capitalism confronts them, and to fight it they have only themselves, their class

unity to rely upon.

The political parties of the working class--we speak of Germany and Italy--have disappeared; only the leaders in exile continue to speak as if they were the parties. This does not mean that they have disappeared forever. If there should come an uprising of the working class, they will come back and present themselves again as leaders. They must be vanquished for the second time, now by the workers, by conscious recognition that they are obsolete.

This does not mean that there will be no more parties in the future, that their role is finished. New parties will arise undoubtedly in revolutionary periods to express in new situations the unavoidable differences of tactical opinions within the working class. Parties in this sense are necessary elements in social development. The working class cannot be given ready-made opinions and platforms from some Dictator Party which claims to do the thinking work for it, and forbids independent opinion. The working class has to think out and to find out the way for itself. Then opinions as to what is and what must be done will differ because their lives--tho in the main rather alike--were different in particulars. Groups of common opinion will be formed to discuss and to propagate their ideas, to fight the scientists of the capitalist class, to wage the spiritual contest with other groups. This is the way of self-education for the working class.

Parties in this sense may be called the scouting groups in the capitalist jungle. They have to investigate the ways, to study science and circumstances, to discuss these in mutual debate, to lay their ideas, their explanations, their advice before their fellow workers. In this way they are the necessary instruments to build up the intellectual power of the working class.

Their task is not to act instead of the workers, to do the real fighting work for the workers and to drag the class behind them. They will not have the power to put themselves in the place of the class. Class unity, class action will be paramount, party opinion subordinate.

II

There are points of similarity between fascist Italy and Germany, and bolshevist Russia. They are ruled by dictators, the chiefs of dictator parties--the Communist Party in Russia, the Fascist Party in Italy, the National-Socialist Party in Germany. These parties are large, strongly organized groups which by their zeal and enthusiasm, their devotion to the cause, by their

discipline and energy are able to dominate state and country, and to enforce upon it the stamp of one hard, big unity.

This is a similarity in form; the contents are different. In Russia state capitalism builds up the productive forces; private capital is not tolerated. In Italy and Germany, the state and the ruling party are intimately connected with private large-scale capitalism. But here also a better economic organization is included in the fascist aims.

Big business always means a certain organization of production, transport and banking in the hands of a small number of directing individuals. And these comparatively few persons have control and power over the mass of lesser capitalists. Political rulers were already connected with these big capitalists before. Now the fascist program proclaims it to be the task of state power to direct and regulate the economic force. The increase of nationalism in all countries, and the preparing for world war, as expressed in the slogan of autarchy, i.e., the complete reliance of each state upon its own resources, imposes upon the political leaders a close cooperation with the leaders of industry. If in the old capitalism the state was a necessary instrument of industry, now industry becomes a necessary instrument of the state, too. Ruling the state and ruling industry is being merged into one. Imposing regulation upon private business now means that by the fascist power the bulk of the lesser capitalists are subjected still more completely to big business.

To be sure, in fascist capitalism the ruling class clings to the principle of private enterprise, if not for others, then at least for themselves. The silent contest of big capitalists, monopolists, bankers, for supremacy and profit goes on behind the scenes. If, however, the economic crisis lasts, then the increasing misery, the rebellions of workers or middle classes will compel the rulers to more efficient regulations of economic life. Already now, capitalist economists look to Russia and study its economics as a possible model, and as a way out. "Planned Economics" is the talk of politicians in many countries. A development of European and American capitalism in the direction of and into some form of state capitalism may offer itself as a means to prevent or to thwart or to turn back a proletarian revolution. This will be called socialism then. If we compare it to the last program, the "Plan" of the Belgian Social-Democratic party for regulating capitalism, the difference is not fundamental. The Belgian plan, indeed, may be called an attempt to compete with fascism in a salvation-action for capitalism.

If now we compare these three parties, the Social-Democratic Party, the Communist Party, the Fascist Party,we find that they have their chief aim in common.They want to dominate and rule the working class. Of course in order to save the workers, to make them happy, to make them free. They all say so.

Their means, their platforms are different; they are competitors, and each abuses the others calling them counter-revolutionaries or criminals.

Social-democracy makes an appeal to democracy; the workers shall choose their masters by vote. The Communist Party resorts to revolution; the workers shall rise at the call of the C.P., overthrow capitalist rule and put the C.P. into office. The fascists make an appeal to national feelings and petty-capitalist instincts. They all aspire to some form of state capitalism or state socialism where the working class is commanded and exploited by the state, by the community of leaders, directors, officials, the managers of production.

Their common basis is the opinion that the working masses are unable to conduct their own affairs. The incapable and stupid many, as they believe, must be led and educated by the capable few.

When the working class fights for its real freedom,in order to take the direction of the production,the rule of society into its own hands, it will find all these parties opposed to it.

-J.H.-

::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::

READ:

Rätekorrespondenz,(theoretisches-und Diskussionsorgan für die Rätebewegung. Herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommunisten (Holland).Einzelnummer 10¢.

Advance .Organ of the Anti-Parliamentary Communist Federation.Order from:31 Rosehall Str.Glasgow,Scotland.

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

The Worlds most significant Thought and Action.
15¢ single copy.Subscription:$ 1.50 a year.
Order from: P.O.Box 44, Sta.O. New York, N.Y.

LUXEMBURG vs. LENIN

While Lenin's position on the national question (1) was on the one hand determined by the social-democratic standpoint of pre-war time, which he had not completely overcome, and on the other appeared to him as a means of setting up and consolidating bolshevist mastery in Russia and its eventual extension on a world-wide scale, for Rosa Luxemburg it had no other meaning than that of a false policy which would be dearly paid for.

In contradistinction to Lenin, for whom, quite in keeping with his general position, organization and the conquest of power for the Party was the necessary presupposition for the victory of Socialism, Rosa Luxemburg's glance was directed to the class needs of the proletariat. Furthermore, while Lenin's theory and practice were tied up mainly with the backward conditions of Russia, Rosa Luxemburg constantly took as her starting point the more highly developed capitalist countries and hence was incapable of seeing in the "historical mission" of the working class a party-and-leadership problem. She laid more weight upon the spontaneous mass movements and the self-initiative of the workers than upon the growth of the organization and the quality of the leaders. Thus she differed fundamentally from Lenin in her appraisal of the factor of spontaneity in history and hence also as regards the role of organization in the class struggle. Before entering into these differences, however, we should like to contrast briefly the views of Luxemburg and Lenin on the Marxian theory of accumulation, since this question is very closely bound up with all the others.

The Collapse of Capitalism.

In her campaign against the Revisionists, Rosa Luxemburg had already emphasized that the labor movement must be prepared to face the question of revolution, not that of reform, since capitalism is inevitably heading toward collapse. In opposition to Revisionism, which strove to impute to capitalism an endless duration, she maintained that "with the assumption that capitalist accumulation has no economic limit, socialism loses its granite

---

(1) The first part of this article appeared in the Modern Monthly, September 1935.

foundation of objective historical necessity. We then take flight into the mist of pre-Marxist systems and schools which sought to deduce socialism from the mere injustice and badness of the present-day world and from the mere revolutionary determination of the working class". (2).

Her principal literary work, conceived as part of her struggle against Reformism, was designed to demonstrate an objective limit to capitalist development, and was at the same time a critique of the Marxian theory of accumulation. (3).

In her opinion, Marx had merely raised the question of accumulation of the total capital, but left it unanswered. (2). His Capital appeared to her "incomplete", a "torso"; it contained "gabs" which were to be filled in. Marx had "represented the process of capital accumulation in a society consisting merely of capitalists and workers"; (3). in his system he "passed over foreign trade" (3) so that it is "just as necessary as at the same time it is impossible, in his system to realize surplus value (4) outside the two existing social classes". In Marx, the accumulation of capital "has become involved in a vicious circle"; his work contains "glaring contradictions", which she set about to overcome. (R. Luxemburg, Antikritik.)

She herself based the necessity of capitalist collapse on "the dialectical contradiction that capitalist accumulation requires for its movement to be surrounded by non-capitalist areas....and can continue only so long as it is provided with such a milieu." (R.Luxemburg, Die Akkumulation des Kapitals.)

She looked for the difficulties of accumulation in the sphere of circulation, in the question of turnover and that of the realization of surplus value, while to Marx these difficulties are already present in the sphere of production, since to him accumulation is a question of capital expansion (Kapitalverwertung). The production of surplus value, not its realization, is to him the real problem. It appeared to Rosa Luxemburg, however, that a

- -

(2) R.Luxemburg: Was die Epigonen aus der Marxschen Theorie gemacht haben (Antikritik). Leipzig,1921. (Written in prison, 1916). As in the first part of this article, we refrain from giving exact references regarding the quotations (volume,page number, etc.),since we translate almost exclusively from German texts.
(3) R.Luxemburg:Die Accumulation des Kapitals.Berlin,1913.
(4) Realization of surplus value:conversion of the produced commodity into money,completed sale,conversion to new capital.

part of the surplus value could not be disposed of in a capitalism such as that represented by Marx; its conversion into new capital was possible only by way of foreign trade with non-capitalist countries. Here is the way she put the matter:

> "The process of accumulation tends everywhere to set in the place of natural economy simple commodity economy, in the place of simple commodity economy the capitalist economy, to bring capitalist production as the one and exclusive mode of production to absolutely dominance in all countries and branches of inductry. Once the final result is attained--tho this remains merely a theoretical construction--accumulation becomes an impossibility. The realization and capitalization of surplus value is transformed into an insoluble task....The impossibility of accumulation means,capitalistically, the impossibility of further unfoldment of the productive forces and thus the objective historical necessity of the decline of capitalism." (R.Luxemburg, Die Akkumulation des Kapitals.)

These reflections of Rosa Luxemburg's were not new; all that was original about them was the foundation she gave them. She attempted to demonstrate their correctness by reference to Marx's scheme of reproduction in the second volume of Capital. According to Marx, capital must accumulate. A definite relation must exist between the different branches of production, in order that the capitalists may find on the market the means of production, the workers and the means of consumption for reproduction. This relation, which is not controlled by human beings, asserts itself blindly by way of the market. Marx reduced it to two comprehensive departments: the production of means of production, and the production of means of consumption. The exchange between the two departments he illustrated by arbitrarily chosen figures. On the basis of this Marxian schema,accumulation proceeds apparently without disturbances. The exchange between the two departments goes on smoothly.

> "If we take the schema literally," says Rosa Luxemburg, "it would appear as if capitalist production exclusively realized its total surplus value and employed the capitalized surplus value for its own needs. If capitalist production, however, is itself exclusively the purchaser of its surplus product, no limit to accumulation is discoverable.....Under the Marxian presuppositions, the schema permits of no other interpretation than limitless production for the sake of production." (R.Luxemburg, Die Akkumulation des Kapitals.)

But that, says Rosa Luxemburg, can after all not be the "purpose" of accumulation. Such a production as that suggested by the schema is "from the capitalist standpoint quite senseless." "The Marxian diagram of accumulation gives no answer to the question: for whom the expanded production really takes place....To be sure, in the course of accumulation, the workers' consumption mounts, as does that of the capitalists; still, the personal consumption of the capitalists comes under the heading of simple reproduction, and for whom do the capitalists produce when they do not consume the entire surplus value, but voluntarily "practice abstinence", i.e. accumulate?....Still less can the purpose pf uninterrupted capital accumulation be the maintenance of an ever greater army of workers, since the consumption of the workers is capitalistically a consequence of accumulation, but never its purpose and its presupposition.... If the Marxian shhema of expanded reproduction were to conform to reality, it would indicate the end of capitalist production," (R.Luxemburg: Die Akkumulation des Kapitals.)

But the frictionless exchange relation between the two great departments of production, their equilibrium, is in the Marxian schema simply impossible, according to Rosa Luxemburg.

> "The assumption of a rising organic composition of capital (9) would show that the maintenance of the necessary quantitative proportion is precluded; that is, the impossibility of long-continued accumulation is demonstrable schematically in purely quantitative terms. An exchange between the two departments is impossible, there remains an unsaleable surplus in the department of consumption goods, an over-production of surplus value which can be realized only in non-capitalist countries." (Die Akkumulation des Kapitals.)

With this theory Rosa Luxemburg explained also the imperialistic necessities of the capitalist countries.

This theory of Rosa Luxemburg's stands in direct contradiction to Lenin's view of the matter, as may be seen from all his works dealing with economics. In complete

- -

(9) Organic composition of capital: the relation between the capital invested in means of production (constant capital) and that invested in wages (variable capital). The expression of the increasing productivity of labor under capitalism is the growth of the organic composition of capital, the more rapid increase of the constant as against the variable capital.

accord with Marx, he looked for the contradictions which pointed to the historical limitations of capitalism, not like Rosa Luxemburg in the sphere of circulation, but in that of production. Lenin took his stand uncritically and unreservedly on the Marxian economic theories, because he regarded them as incapable of being supplemented. In his own theoretical works he confined himself to employing the Marxian doctrines in investigating the development of capitalism in general and of Russian capitalism in particular. There is a special, though still untranslated work of Lenin's against Rosa Luxemburg's theory of accumulation, but it merely repeats the viewpoint which he has set down in all his other works on the subject and which we have merely to become acquainted with here in order completely to grasp the full force of the contradiction between the two conceptions.

In his writings against the Narodniki, (10) Lenin had already anticipated many of his arguments against Rosa Luxemburg's conception. The Narodniki asserted that the domestic capitalist market was insufficient for the unfoldment of capitalist economy and moreover that it continually diminished with the accompanying impoverishment of the masses. Like Rosa Luxemburg later, they also could not grant that the capitalist surplus value could be realized without foreign markets. According to Lenin, however, the question of the realization of surplus value has nothing to do with this problem; "the lugging in of foreign trade does not solve the problem, but merely shifts it." (Lenin: The Development of Capitalism in Russia, 1899.)

To him the necessity of the foreign market for a capitalist country is "not at all explained by the laws of the realization of the social product (and of surplus value in particular), but by the fact that capitalism arises only as the result of a highly developed commodity circulation which goes beyond the boundaries of the State". (Lenin: The Development of Capitalism in Russia.) The disposal of the product on the foreign market explains nothing, "but itself demands an explanation, that

---

(10) Narodniki (populists) is the name given to the "social revolutionists" and popular socialists in contradistinction to Marxists. Mostly intellectuals who "went to the people" for the purpose of safeguarding their interests by way of reform.-- They could not bring themselves to believe in a capitalist development for Russia, on the ground that the main condition to this end was the development of a foreign market, which was not present because Russia had come upon the capitalist scene too late.

is, the finding out of his equivalent....When one speaks of the 'difficulties' of realization," says Lenin, "one must also realize that these 'difficulties' are not only possible but also unavoidable, and in fact with regard to all parts of the capitalist product and not to the surplus value alone. The difficulties of this sort, which originate in the unproportional distribution of the different branches of production, arise constantly not only in connection with the realization of surplus value, but also in connection with the realization of the variable and constant capital; not only in connection with the realization of the product in the form of comsumption goods, but also in the form of means of production." (Lenin: The Development of Capitalism in Russia.)

"As we know", writes Lenin in his 'Characterization of Economic Romanticism,1899', "the law of capitalist production consists in the fact that the constant capital increases faster than the variable; that is, an ever greater part of the newly formed capital flows to that department of social production which turns out means of production. Consequently, this department must unconditionally grow more rapidly than the one which turns out means of consumption. Consequently, the means of consumption come to occupy a less and less prominent part in the total mass of capitalist production. And that is in full harmony with the historical mission of capitalism and its specific social structure:the former consists, that is, in the development of the productive forces of society; the latter precludes the utilization thereof by the mass of the population."

Nothing is to Lenin "more senseless than to deduce from this contradiction between production and consumption that Marx had contested the possibilities of realizing surplus value in capitalist society, or had explained crises as resulting from insufficient consumption..... The different branches of industry which serve each other as a "market" do not develop uniformly, they overtake each other and the more developed industry seeks foreign markets. This circumstance does not by any means indicate that it is impossible for the capitalist nation to realize surplus value....It merely points to the unproportionality in the development of the various industries. With a different distribution of the national capital, the same quantity of products could be realized within the country." (Lenin:The Development of Capitalism in Russia.)

So far as Lenin was concerned, Marx with his scheme of reproduction had "completely cleared up the process of the realization of the product in general and of surplus value in particular, and revealed that there was

no justification whatever for lugging the foreign market into the question." (Lenin: The Development of Capitalism in Russia.) Capitalism's susceptibility to crisis and its expansionist tendencies are explained for Lenin by the lack of uniformity in the development of the various branches of industry. It is from the monopolist character of capitalism that he derives the constant colonial expansion and the imperialistic partition of the world. By means of capital export and the control over sources of raw materials, the bourgeoisie of the leading capitalist countries derives enormous extra profits. The imperialist expansion, in his view, does not serve so much for the realization of surplus value as for increasing the mass of profits. (Cf. Lenin: Imperialism as the last phase in the Development of Capitalism, 1915).

There is no doubt that Lenin's conception is much closer to the Marxian than is Rosa Luxemburg's. It is true that the latter was quite correct in recognizing in the Marxian theory of accumulation the law of collapse of capitalism; she overlooked, however, the Marxian basis for this view and produced her own theory of realization, which Lenin correctly rejected as unmarxist and false. It is interesting to note in this connection, however, that in the bibliography appended to his biography of Marx, Lenin referred to the "analysis of the (Luxemburgian) false interpretation of the Marxist theory by OttoBauer". (Lenin: Bibliography of Marxism. In the Collected Works.)

Now Bauer's critique of Rosa Luxemburg's theory of accumulation (O. Bauer: Die Akkumulation des Kapitals. Neue Zeit, 1913) had rightly been denoted by the latter in her Anticritique, as a "disgrace for the official Marxism"; for Bauer repeated in his attacks nothing but the revisionist conception that capitalism is without objective limits. To his mind, "capitalism is conceivable even without expansion"....It is "not on the mechanical impossibility of realizing surplus value" that capitalism will go down, he says, but "on the indignation to which it drives the masses of the people....It will receive its death blow from the constantly growing working class, schooled, united and organized thru the mechanism of capitalist production itself." (O. Bauer: Die Akkumulation des Kapitals.)

By means of a modified schema of reproduction which avoided many of the defects deplored by Rosa Luxemburg in that of Marx, Bauer endeavored to furnish proof that even on the assumption of a rising organic composition of capital, a frictionless exchange between the two departments in the schema of capitalist reproduction was still possible. Rosa Luxemburg demonstrated to him, however, that even in his modified schema an unsaleable

surplus remains over in the department of consumption, and that in order to be realized it compels to the conquest of new markets. To this, Bauer had nothing more to say. And nevertheless Lenin referred to him as the "analyst of Rosa Luxemburg's false theory."

Not only did Bauer's argument leave Rosa Luxemburg unscathed; there is also the fact that the conclusions which he drew from his schema, indicating unlimited accumulation (independently of the question of the exchange relation between the two departments), could be demonstrated with referrence to this same schema as wholly unfounded. Henryk Grossman proved that if Bauer's schema were expanded to cover a longer period of time, the result was not Bauer's frictionless unfoldment of capitalism, but the collapse of capital expansion. The struggle against Rosa Luxemburg's theory of collapse had led merely to a new one. (H.Grossman: Das Akkumulations-und Zusammenbruchsgesetz des kapitalistischen Systems,1929.)

The dispute between Luxemburg and Bauer, which found Lenin's sympathies on the side of the latter, was a dispute over nothing, and again it is not without interest to note that the senselessness of the whole discussion was not observed by Lenin. This discussion turned on the impossibility or possibility of a frictionless exchange relation between the two departments of the Marxian reproduction schema, on which depended the full realization of surplus value. In the Marxian system, the schema was thought of merely as an aid to theoretical analysis and was not conceived as having any objective basis in reality. Henryk Grossmann, in his convincing reconstruction of the plan of Marx's Capital (H.Grossmann:Die Aenderung des Aufbauplans des Marxschen Kapitals. Archiv f.d.Geschichte d.Sozialismus u.d.Arbeiterbewegung,1929.) as well as in other works, has revealed the real meaning of the reproduction schema and thus set the discussion with reference to Marx's theory of accumulation on a new and more fruitful basis. The entire criticism directed at Marx by Luxemburg on the basis of this schema was posited on the assumption that the reproduction schema had an objective basis.

But, says Grossmann, (Die Wert-Preis-Transformation bei Marx und das Krisenproblem. Zeitschrift fur Sozialforschung,1932.) "the schema, in itself, lays no claim to presenting a picture of concrete capitalist reality. It is only a link in the Marxian process of approximation, one which forms with other simplifying assumptions, on which the schema is grounded, and with the later modifications by which the matter is made progressively more concrete an inseparable whole. Thus any one of these three parts without the two others becomes completely

meaningless for the recognition of the truth, and can have no further significance than a preliminary stage of knowledge, the first step in the process of approaching concrete reality (Annaherungsverfahren)".

The Marxian schema deals with the exchange values, but in reality the commodities are not exchanged at their values but at production prices. "In a reproduction schema built on values, different rates of profit must arise in each department of the schema. There is in reality, however, a tendency for the different rates of profit to be equalized to average rates, a circumstance which is already embraced in the concept of production prices, So that if one wants to take the schema as a basis for criticising or granting the possibility of realizing surplus value, it would first have to be transformed into a price schema." (H.Grossmann: Die Wert-Preis-Transformation.)

Even if Rosa Luxemburg had been successful in demonstrating that in the Marxian schema the full turnover of the commodities is impossible, that with each year an increasing superfluity of means of consumption must arise, what would she have proved? "Merely the circumstance that the 'indisposable remainder' in the consumption department arises within the schema of value, that is, on the presupposition that the commodities are exchanged at their values". (H.Grossmann: Die Wert-Preis-Transformation. But this presupposition does not exist in reality. The schema of value on which Luxemburg's analysis is based has different rates of profit in the various branches of production, and these rates are not equated to average rates, since the schema takes no account of competition. What do Luxemburg's conclusions amount to then as regards reality, when they are derived from a schema having no objective validity?

"Since competition gives rise to the transformation of values into production prices and thereby the redistribution of the surplus value among the branches of industry (in the schema), whereby there necessarily occurs also a change in the previous proportionality relation of the spheres of the schema, it is quite possible and even probable that a 'consumption balance' in the value schema subsequently vanishes in the production-price schema and, inversely, an original equilibrium of the value schema is subsequently transformed in the production-price schema into a disproportionality." (H.Grossmann: Die Wert-Preis-Transformation.)

The theoretical confusion of Rosa Luxemburg is best illustrated in the fact that on the one hand she sees in the average rate of profit the governing factor which "actually treats each individual capital only as part of

the total social capital, accords it profit as a part of the surplus value to which it is entitled in accordance with its magnitude without regard to the quantity which it has actually won," (R.Luxemburg: Die Akkumulation des Kapitals.) and that she nevertheless examines the question as to whether a complete exchange is possible; and that on the basis of a schema which knows no average rate of profit. If one takes into account this average rate of profit, Rosa Luxemburg's disproportionality argument loses all value, since one department sells above and the other under value and on the basis of the production price the undisposable part of the surplus value may vanish.

Marx's law of accumulation is identical with that of the fall of the rate of profit. The fall of the rate of profit can be compensated by the growth of the mass of profit for only a limited time, due to the continuous compulsion to accumulation. It is not from an excess of surplus value incapable of being realized that capitalism goes under according to Marx, but from lack of surplus value. Rosa Luxemburg completely overlooked the consequences of the fall of the rate of profit;and for this reason, she also had to raise the question, meaningless from the Marxian standpoint, as to the 'purpose' of accumulation.

"It is said", she writes, "that capitalism will go under because of the fall of the rate of profit....This comfort is unfortunately quite dissipated by a single sentence from Marx, namely, the statement that for large capitals the fall of the rate of profit is counterbalanced by mass of profit. The decline of capitalism from the fall of the rate of profit is therefore still a good way off, somewhat like the time required for the sun's extinction". (R.Luxemburg: Antikritik). She failed to see that while Marx had, to be sure, set forth such a fact, he had also at the same time suggested its limit, and that the fall of the rate of profit results in the fall of the mass of profit; in fact, that the former gives expression to what is at first the relative, and then the absolute fall of the actual mass of profit, in relation to capital's needs for accumulation.

It is true that Lenin had found it conceivable that "the rate of profit has a tendency to sink", (Lenin: Karl Marx, in the Collected Works.) and he referred to the fact that "Marx had analyzed this tendency and a number of circumstances by which it was concealed or which operated to counter-act it." (Lenin: Karl Marx) But the full importance of this law in the Marxian system he too failed to grasp clearly; a fact which explains, on the one hand, his acceptance of Bauer's rejoinder to Rosa Luxemburg, and on the other the restriction of his own explanation

of crisis to the disproportional development of the various spheres of production. And, for that matter, it may explain also his contradictory conceptions, by which at one time he believed in an unavoidable end of capitalism, and at another time emphasized that there were absolutely no situations from which capitalism could not find a way out. There is not to be found in his works any convincing economic argument for the end of capitalism, and yet at the same time he has the firmest conviction that the system is unavoidably heading toward its fall. This may be explained by the fact that while he did not believe with Bauer and the Social Democracy in the possibility of the reformist transformation of capitalism to socialism, he nevertheless assumed with them that the overthrow of capitalism was exclusively a question of the development of the revolutionary consciousness of the working class or, more precisely stated, a question of organization and its leadership.

Spontaneity and the Role of Organization

We have previously seen that Rosa Luxemburg correctly emphasized that for Marx the law of accumulation was at the same time the law of collapse of capitalism. Her reasoning was false; the conclusions nevertheless were correct. Tho in her explanation of the law of collapse she diverged completely from Marx, she yet recognized the existence of that law. Lenin's arguments against the Luxemburgian conception were sound, and, so far as they went, completely in harmony with Marx; nevertheless, he evaded the question as to whether capitalism is faced with an objective limit. His own doctrine of crisis is inadequate and inconsistent. His theory, while more correct, did not lead to truly revolutionary conclusions. Rosa Luxemburg's argument, even tho false, still remained revolutionary. For the question is one of emphasizing and demonstrating capitalism's tendency to collapse.

Lenin, who still stood much nearer than Rosa Luxemburg to the Social Democracy, saw the collapse of capitalism more as a conscious political act than as an economic necessity. He failed to see that the question of whether the economic or the political factor predominates with reference to the proletarian revolution is not one of abstract theory but of the concrete situation of the moment. The two factors are in reality inseparable in other than a purely conceptual sense. Lenin had accepted much of Hilferding's speculations regarding capitalist development, which according to the latter tended toward a so-called "general cartell". (R.Hilferding: Das Finanzkapital,1909). That is to say, it was not only that,as at first, he had to set out from the bourgeois character of the coming Russian revolution and thus consciously adapted himself to its bourgeois manifestations and nec-

essities, but he was also later burdened with the Hilferdingian attitude in relation to the more highly developed capitalist countries, and thus arrived at his over-estimation of the "political side" of the proletarian revolution.

According to Lenin, it was also false to assume (and this held for the international scene) that we are living in the age of the pure proletarian revolution; in fact, to him such a revolution can never be. The true revolution is for him the dialectical conversion of the bourgeois revolution into the proletarian. The demands of the bourgeois revolution which are still on the order of the day can henceforth be actualized only within the framework of the proletarian revolution; but this proletarian revolution is proletarian only in the leadership; it embraces all the oppressed who must become the allies of the proletariat: the peasants, the middle classes, the colonial peoples, oppressed nations, etc. This genuine revolution takes place in the age of imperialism, which, developed by the monopolization of economy, is for Lenin a "parasitical", a "stagnating" capitalism, "the last stage of capitalist development" immediately before the outbreak of the social revolution. (Lenin: Address to the First Congress of the Soviets, 1917). Imperialism leads, in Lenin's conception, "very near to complete socialization of production; it drags, as it were, the capitalist against his will and without his being aware of the fact, into a social order which offers a transition from complete freedom of competition to complete socialization." (Lenin: Imperialism.)

Monopoly capitalism has, according to Lenin, already made production ripe for socialization; the only remaining question is to take the control over economy out of the hands of the capitalists and put it in the hands of the State, and then also to regulate distribution according to socialist principles. The whole question of socialism is one of the conquest of political power for the proletarian party, which would then actualize socialism for the workers. Between Lenin and the Social Democracy there were no differences so far as concerned socialist construction and its organizational problems. The only difference had reference to the manner in which control over production was to be acquired: by parliamentary or by revolutionary means. The possession of political power, the control over the complete monopoly, were in both conceptions a sufficient solution of the problem of socialist economy. For this reason also Lenin is not alarmed at the prospect of state capitalism, against the opponents of which he says at the eleventh party congress of the Bolsheviks: "State capitalism is that form of capitalism which we shall be in a position to restrict, to

establish its limits; this capitalism is bound up with the State, and the State--that is the workers, the most advanced part of the workers, the vanguard, is we. And it is we on whom the nature of this state capitalism will depend." (11).

While for Otto Bauer the proletarian revolution depended alone on the attitude of the class-conscious, organized workers, on the political will (which from a single glance at the social-democratic organization, by which its members were completely dominated, practically meant that it depended on Otto Bauer & Company), so here for Lenin the fate of the state capitalism depends on the attitude of the Party, which in turn is determined by the bureaucracy, and the whole of history is again the history of the magnanimity, the selflessness and the gallantry of a group of people who are trained in these virtues by the most supremely virtuous.

But with this position of Lenin's on state capitalism, which for him is determined in accordance with will and not by economic laws, in spite of the fact that the laws of state capitalism are not other than those of monopoly capitalism, Lenin had only remained true to himself, for to him in the last analysis the revolution also depended on the quality of the party and of its leadership. In harmony with Kautsky, for whom the revolutionary consciousness indispensably necessary to the revolution (a consciousness which for Kautsky was ideology and nothing else) could only be brought to the workers from the outside, since the workers were incapable of developing it out of themselves, Lenin also asserted that "the working class, exclusively by its own efforts, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness; that is, it may realize the necessity for combining in unions, to fight against the employers and to strive to compel the government to pass necessary labor legislation, etc. The social doctrine, however, has proceeded from the philosophical, historical and economic theories which originated with educated representatives of the owning classes, the intellectuals." (Lenin: What is To Be Done?) A political consciousness, the necessary presupposition of the socialist victory, the workers, according to Lenin, were incapable of developing. Thus socialism had again ceased to be the "work of the working class," as Marx viewed it;

- -

(11) It is amusing to take a look at this gradation: The State, that is the workers, (first restriction) the most advanced part, (second restriction) the vanguard, (last restriction) that is we; that is, the Bolsheviks, who in their turn are so hierarchized that Lenin would finally be able to say like the great French king: "The State, that is I ! "

socialism now depended on the revolutionary ideology of the bourgeoisie; and no doubt the religious "Marxist" J.Middleton Murry is today merely following in the traces of Kautsky and Lenin when he comes to the logical conclusion that the whole of socialism is nothing more than "substantially a movement of converted bourgeois." (Marxism--a symposium--London,1935.)

Certainly, Lenin stands on Marxist ground when he asserts that the workers are incapable of developing a political consciousness. In his polemic against Arnold Ruge, who so sadly deplored the lack of political consciousness, and was puzzled by this lack because after all such consciousness ought to have been developed by the impoverishment existing at the time, Marx said:"It is false to say that social distress creates political understanding. The truth is rather the reverse: social well-being creates political understanding. Political understanding is an intellectual quality and is given to him who already has, who lives in clover." (K.Marx: On the King of Prussia and Social Reform. Selected Essays.)

But Lenin has no further connection with Marx,and sinks to the level of the bourgeois revolutionist a' la Ruge, when he cannot conceive of a proletarian revolution without this intellect-consciousness, when he makes the revolution a matter of the conscious intervention of the "knowing ones", or of the professional revolutionists. Against this Ruge-Lenin conception, Marx said: "The more cultivated and general the political understanding of a people, the more does the proletariat... dissipate its energies in irrational, useless and brutally suppressed revolts. Because the proletariat thinks along political lines, it perceives the cause of all evils in the wills of men and all remedies to lie in force and the overthrow of a particular form of the State....Political understanding conceals from it the roots of social distress; distorts its insight into its real aims, deceives its social instinct".(K.Marx: On the King of Prussia.)

To Ruge's assertion (and Lenin's position) that a revolution without the "political soul" is impossible, Marx answers: "A revolution of political souls organizes a ruling clique in society, in accordance with the limited and doubly-cleft nature of these souls, at the cost of society." (K.Marx: On the King of Prussia.) But Lenin had never aimed at more than a change of mastery over the means of production, since this seemed to him to suffice for socialism. Hence also his over-emphasis on the subjective, political factor,--a circumstance by which he was led to view the organizational work of socialism as a political act. According to Marx there is indeed no socialism without revolution, and this revo-

lution is the political act of the proletariat. But the proletariat "requires this political act only insofar as it has need of the process of destruction and dissolution. Where the organizing activity begins,where its proper aim, its soul emerges, there socialism casts away the political hull." (K.Marx: Selected Essays.)

The bourgeois elements in Lenin's thought, which in the first place make the end of capitalism dependent on certain political presuppositions which are not necessarily present; which, furthermore, fancied that increasing monopolization was identical with the socialization of production (a thing which today it is obvious to anyone is not the case), which made the whole matter of socialism dependent on the taking over of the monopolies by the State and the replacing of an old by a new bureaucracy, and for which the revolution was reduced to a contest between the revolutionists and the bourgeoisie for winning the masses: such a position had necessarily to minimize the revolutionary element of the spontaneous mass movement and its power and clarity of goal in order to be able to magnify correspondingly the individual role and that of socialist consciousness which has become congealed to an ideology.

Lenin cannot, to be sure, deny the element of spontaneity, but for him it is "essentially nothing other than the germinal form of consciousness," (12) which is brought to completion in the organization and only then is truly revolutionary because completely conscious.The spontaneous awakening of the masses does not satisfy him; it does not suffice for socialist victory." The fact that the masses are spontaneously entering the movement," he writes, "does not make the organization of this struggle less necessary. On the contrary, it makes it more necessary." (13)

The mistake inherent in the spontaneity theory, he says is that "it belittles the role of the conscious element and that it "refuses strong individual leadership",which for Lenin is "essential to class success." The weaknesses of organization are to him the weaknesses of the labor movement itself. The struggle must be organized, the organization planned; all depends on that and the correct leadership. This latter must have influence over the masses, and this influence counts more than the masses. Where and how the masses are organized, whether in soviets or in trade unions, is, to him, a matter of indifference. The important thing is that they be led by the Bolsheviks.

- -

(12) Lenin: On Trade Unions; in the Collected Works.
(13) Lenin: What is To Be Done?

Rosa Luxemburg sees these matters in a quite different light. She does not confuse revolutionary consciousness with the intellect-consciousness of the Leninist professional revolutionists, but for her it is the act-consciousness of the masses themselves, growing from the constraint of necessity. The masses act revolutionary because they cannot act otherwise, and because they must act. Marxism to her is not only ideology which crystallizes in the organization, but the living and struggling proletariat which actualizes Marxism not because it wants to, but because it cannot do otherwise. While for Lenin the masses are only the material which the conscious revolutionists work, just as to the street-car motorman the street-car serves only for traveling, in Rosa Luxemburg's writings the conscious revolutionists spring not only from growing insight but more still from the mass in its actual revolutionary activity. It is not only that she rejects on principle the over-emphasis on the role of organization and leadership; she demonstrates from experience that "during the revolution it is extremely difficult for any directing organ of the proletarian movement to foresee and calculate which occasions and factors can lead to explosions and which cannot..... The rigid, mechanical, bureaucratic conception," she says, "cannot conceive of the struggle save as the product of organization at a certain stage of its strength. On the contrary, the living, dialectical explanation makes the organization arise as a product of the struggle." (14)

With reference to the Russian mass-strike movement of 1905 she says: "There was no predetermined plan, no organized action, because the appeals of the parties could scarcely keep in pace with the spontaneous rising of the masses; the leaders had scarcely time to formulate the watchwords of the on-rushing crowd." And generalizing, she continues: "If the situation should lead to mass strikes in Germany, it will almost certainly not be the best organized workers who will develop the greatest capacity for action, but the worst organized or totally unorganized." (14)

"Revolutions", she expressly emphasizes, "cannot be made at command. Nor is this at all the task of the Party. Our duty is only at all times to speak out plainly without fear or trembling; that is, to hold clearly before the masses their tasks in the given historical moment, and to proclaim the political program of action and the slogans which result from the situation. The concern with whether and when the revolutionary mass movement takes up with them must be left

- -

(14) R. Luxemburg: Der Massenstreik, 1906.

confidently to history itself. Even tho socialism may at first appear as a voice crying in the wilderness, it yet provides for itself a moral and political position the fruits of which it later, when the hour of historical fulfillment strikes, garners with compound interest." (R.Luxemburg: Spartakusbriefe,1917)

Rosa Luxemburg's spontaneity conception has often been denounced, the usual thing been to denominate it as a "catastrophe policy" as directed against the organization of the labor movement itself. She frequently found it necessary to emphasize that her conception was "not pour la désorganisation". (R.Luxemburg: Brief an Kautsky, 1905.) "The Social Democrats", she wrote, are the most enlightened, most class-conscious vanguard of the proletariat. They cannot and dare not wait in a fatalistic fashion, with folded arms, for the advent of the revolutionary situation; wait for that which, in every spontaneous movement, falls from the clouds. On the contrary, they must now, as always, hasten the development of things and endeavor to accelerate events." (R. Luxemburg: Der Massenstreik.)

This role of the organization she regards as possible and therefore welcome and a matter of course, while Lenin regards it as absolutely necessary and makes the whole revolution dependent on the fulfillment of this necessity. This difference regarding the significance of organization for the revolution involves also two different conceptions regarding form and content of the organization itself. According to Lenin, "the only serious principle of organization for our movement is the most absolute secrecy, the strictest selection of members (15), the forming of professional revolutionists. Once these qualities are present, something more still is assured than 'democracy', namely, complete comradely confidence among the revolutionists. And this 'more' is for us unconditionally necessary, for with us....there can be no question of replacing it by democratic control. It is a great mistake to believe that the impossibility of a real democratic control makes the members of the revolutionary organization uncontrollable. They have no time to think of puppet-like forms of democracy, but they feel their

- -

(15) This "principle" was dropped by Lenin whenever such a course appeared opportune. Thus he once threw away the 50,000 revolutionary workers of the German Communist Labor Party (K.A.P.D.) in order not to be deprived of the five million votes of the reformist Independent Socialist Party (U.S.P.D.) of Germany.

responsibility very keenly." (16)

By means of the rules of organization (which, so long as they were democratic, meant nothing) Lenin wanted to "forge a more or less sharp weapon against opportunism. The deeper the source of opportunism lies, the sharper must be this weapon. (17) This weapon was "centralism", the strictest discipline in the Party, the complete subordination of all activity to the instructions of the central committee. Of course, Rosa Luxemburg was admirably capable of tracing this "night-watchman spirit" (18) of Lenin's to the special situation of the Russian intellectuals; but "it is false to think," (she writes against Lenin) "that the still impracticable majority rule of the workers within their party-organization may be replaced by a sole-mastery on the part of the central authority of the party, and that the lacking public control on the part of the working masses over the acts and omissions of the party organs would be just as well replaced by the inverted control of a central committee over the activity of the revolutionary workers." (18) And even tho the self-leadership of the workers should lead to blunders and false steps, Rosa Luxemburg is nevertheless ready to take all this into the bargain, for she is convinced that "even mistakes which a truly revolutionary labor movement commits are, in historical perspective, immeasurably more fruitful and valuable than the infallibility of the very best 'central committee' ". (18)

The differences between Luxemburg and Lenin which we have here pointed out have in part already been more or less surpassed by history. Many of the things which gave substance to this dispute are of no moment today. Nevertheless, the essential factor in their debates, whether the revolution depends on the organized labor movement or on the spontaneous movement of the workers, is of the most pressing significance. But here also history has already decided in favor of Rosa Luxemburg. Leninism is buried under the ruins of the Third International. A new labor movement which has no concern with the social-democratic remains which were still recognizable in Lenin and Luxemburg, nor yet has any

- -

(16) Lenin: What Is To Be Done? - Lenin's idealism comes to light in this formulation as well. Instead of actually and materially assuring control thru organizing that control within the organization, he replaces it by "something better", by the phrases "comradely confidence" and "feeling of responsibility". Practically, however, this meant: mechanical obedience, order from above, conformity below.

(17) Lenin: One Step Forward, Two Steps Backward; 1904.

(18) R. Luxemburg: Organizational Questions of the Russian Social Democracy. Neue Zeit, 1905.

intention of renouncing the lessons of the past, is arising. To separate itself from the deadly traditional influences of the old labor movement has become its first prerequisite, and here Rosa Luxemburg is as great an aid as Leninism has been a hindrance. This new movement of the workers with its inseparable nucleus of conscious revolutionists can do more with Luxemburg's revolutionary theory, in spite of its many weaknesses, and derive from it more hope, than from the total accomplishment of the Leninist international. And as Rosa Luxemburg once said, in the midst of the World War and the collapse of the Second International, so the present-day revolutionists can say in view of the collapse of the Third International: "But we are not lost, and we shall conquer if we have not unlearned how to learn."

.....

Council Correspondence recommends:

F.ENGELS : Principles of Communism	15 ¢
A.M.Simons: Class Struggles in America	10 ¢
MARX: Wage-Labor and Capital	10 ¢
A.Pannekoek: Marxism and Darwinism	10 ¢
Marx-Engels: The Communist Manifesto	5 ¢
MARX: Value,Price and Profit	20 ¢
The Bourgeois Role of Bolshevism	10 ¢
R.Luxemburg: Leninism or Marxism	10 ¢
Bolshevism or Communism	5 ¢
What Next for the American Workers ?	5 ¢
World-Wide Fascism or World Revolution	5 ¢
Outline of Production & Distribution in Communism (Soon to be published)	10 ¢
THE INEVITABILITY OF COMMUNISM A critique Sidney Hook's Interpretation of Marx	25 ¢
ANTI-DUEHRING Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science By F.Engels	$ 2.00
SELECTED ESSAYS; by Karl Marx A Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right On the Jewish Question On the King of Prussia and Social Reforms.	$ 2.00

Order all books dealing with Marxism and the Problems of the Working Class from Council Correspondence.
1604 N.California Ave. Chicago, Ill.

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Land of Promise

REPORT FROM PALESTINE

The Masters of Tomorrow

Fascism and Bolshevism

"Councils" and Soviets

The Permanent Revolution

By MAX NOMAD

The Party and the Class

Vol. II **Nos. 9 & 10**

SEPTEMBER 1936

$1.00 YEARLY 10c A COPY

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

.·. Published at 1237 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois .·.

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

THE LAND OF PROMISE

-- Report from Palestine --

The reports on the new situation in Palestine generally speak of the building up of the country by way of jewish capital and jewish labor, of the resulting prosperity, of the more or less uniform participation in this prosperity by the entire jewish people, and of the good prospects for a more and more extensive happy development. These reports are the more calculated to arouse comment and hopes as for some time now in the other countries the lot of the working class and middle bourgeois elements is an increasingly wretched one. Thruout the world, as the crisis continues, products and means of production are being destroyed. Everywhere unemployment reigns, and the masses are looking forward apathetically to a new world war. Only Palestine, the country in process of building up, is said to form an exception.

In Palestine, the moneys of jewish and british capitalists are being turned to account. Toward Palestine press the increasingly impoverished jewish artisans and workers from Eastern Europe and the U.S.A., the arab nomads and peasants, the oriental Jews. With the setting in of the crisis and with the advance of monopolization, a migration to Palestine arose thru the growth of Fascism with the accompanying impoverishment

of the jewish middle stratum, as in Germany, thru anti-Semitism. In these countries a nationalistic sentiment takes form among the Jews; and there is a strengthening of the same sentiment among the Arabs, among whom a great national movement had existed as early as 1917.

Zionism or Palestinism, the national movement of the jewish masses, is divided into various parties, corresponding to the class stratification. There are two democratic-liberal parties, which arose thru the split in the party of the "General Zionists". The smaller of the two new parties stands closer to the fascists, the larger to the labor party. There is a large fascist party, the "Revisionists", with a few small splinter groups in its train. Furthermore, a large clerical party of the "Misrachi". The labor party (MAPAI) and the "General Federation of Jewish Labor in the Land of Israel" (Histadruth) are reformist-nationalistic. To these may be added also a reformist organization ("HashomerHazair") made up of the members of the agrarian labor communes; various youth organizations; and a women's organization("Wizo").

All these groups advocate immigration of the Jews of all countries to Palestine. This immigration is opposed only by the illegal group of the Comintern (PCP).

Palestine is bounded on the west by the Mediterranean Sea, on the north by Mount Lebanon, on the east by the River Jordan and on the south by the desert of Sinai. It has an area of about 10,000 square miles.

From west to east, Palestine is divided into three plains which run approximately parallel to the seacoast. In the west, the fertile lowland; in the middle, the highlands; and in the east, the Jordan depression. The central highlands attain an elevation of 2500 feet. The surface of the Dead Sea, into which the Jordan issues, lies about 1300 feet below sea level.

Within the Ottoman Empire, Palestine consisted of a few administrative districts (vilayets) of the turkish province of Syria. After the War, and the arab uprising, Palestine was separated from the other arab countries and made a british mandate territory, which was to be administered by England under the League of Nations. (The same sort of thing occurred with the northern part of Syria, which was divided into four parts and placed under a french mandate.)The mandate over Palestine goes back to the Balfour Declaration, (November 2,1917), according to which the government of his british majesty looked with favor upon the.

establishment in Palestine of "a National Home for the Jewish people,...it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine or the rights and the political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country".

The government for Palestine is located in Jerusalem. It consists of the High Commissioner and his three leading officials and the department heads. The government is subordinate to the Colonial Office in London, to which all laws must be submitted for approval. In Jerusalem is located also the headquarters of the english aerial and land troops. Jerusalem is connected with the two other large cities, Haifa and Jaffa-Tel-Aviv, by good automobile roads and a railway.

Jaffa is mainly a port for the orange export trade. Haifa, whose harbor has been improved, is at the same time a base of the british Mediterranean fleet. Into Haifa runs the southern arm of the pipe line which brings the oil from Mosul to the sea; the northern arm passes thru mandate territory of France. There are also a few airports of the lines running between Europe and South Africa and Europe and Eastern Asia. Further airports are being planned.

On the eastern boundary of Palestine is the Transjordan, which likewise is administered under an english mandate, and by the same High Commissioner in Jerusalem. In Transjordan also "reigns" the Emir Abdullah, a brother of Feisal. In the southwest, Palestine borders on Egypt. A railway line connects Cairo by way of Jaffa with Haifa and Jerusalem; it is joined onto the Hezaz Railway and has a bus connection with Bagdad and Beirut. Palestine is thus an important part of the British Empire, for communication by water as well as by land, and--still more important today--by air.

The officially recognized languages are English, Arabic and Hebrew. English is hardly spoken except by the higher officials; the rest of the population speaks Arabic, except for the jewish youth and the oriental Jews who speak Hebrew. The jewish population also speaks the languages of their country of origin, and mostly Yiddish. The jewish press, however, comes out in Hebrew.

The population of Palestine, according to the government census of Oct.23,1922, was distributed as follows: Rural - 389,534; Urban - 264,317; Nomads - 103,331; a total of 757,182.

In 1934, the racial division of the population was estimated as: Arabs - 870,000, and Jews - 310,000.

The methods of production in Palestine are in part still biblical in their primitiveness. Among the arab nomad tribes the closed family economy (clan) is dominant. This form is breaking up, thru sale of animals and lands, into wage labor. A large part of the arab agriculture is still reminiscent of the Middle Ages and Feudalism. The large landed proprietors (effendis) lease the ground to arab peasants (fellahs), by whom it has been tilled for long generations. The rental amounts in general to one-fifth of the yield in kind, The effendi also lends money to the fellahs so that they may purchase the necessary harvesting implements. The interest rate ranges up to 150%.

The effendis form a part of the population of the arab city, insofar as they don't prefer to consume their revenue, raked in by the overseers, in foreign parts. Some of them also sell parts of the soil and set up on the balance an intensive plantation economy. In the measure in which the effendis make the transition from leasing to running plantations, the fellahs become wage workers. A 1929 estimate proportions the soil of Palestine, from the agricultural point of view, as follows: cultivated - 5515 sq. km., cultivable, but not cultivated - 3389 sq.km., uncultivable (forest and pasture land) - 7750 sq.km., not specified - 3346 sq. km., a total of 20,000 sq.km. The balance of 6,000 sq. km. is probably desert.

The arab city is mainly a trading center. The inhabitants, tradesmen and artisans, are usually also land owners.

The jewish colonization began around 1880. The first jewish villages, confronted by economic collapse, were rescued at the time by a Baron Rothschild thru the introduction of improved plants and by financial support. The first Zionist Congress was held in 1897, at which the goal proclaimed was that of "establishing for the Jewish people a publicly recognized and legally secured home in Palestine."

There is in existence a Jewish National Fund (KKL) and a Palestine Foundation Fund (KH). The KKL, which is the central land purchasing agency of the zionist organization, was brought into being in 1902 for the purpose of acquiring land as the inalienable property of the jewish people. The land is purchased from the arab owners, effendis and families, clans and village communities, and often leads to the driving off of the fellahs from the land of the effendis. In a few

cases, more recently, the Arabs are left in possession of smaller surface areas, which they are now intensively cultivating with the aid of credits and modern implements. In 1934 the KKL possessed an area of 41,500 hectares. The KH began its activity in the year 1921; it finances agricultural and urban colonization, education, immigration, health, religious and communal institutions. Both funds are subject to the executive authority and the committee of action, elected by the Congress which meets every two years. The congress is elected on a democratic basis by the zionist organizations of all countries, and thereby financed: anyone who pays a shilling has the right to vote in selecting the delegates. The zionist bodies are combined with other non-zionist, but still jewish, bodies to form the expanded Jewish Agency.

The jewish agricultural activity is divided between plantation economy, cereal culture and mixed farming. On the plantations (end of 1934: 15,000 hectares jewish, 10,000 hectares arab) the products are citrus fruits, almonds and wine. The operation is by estates (5 ha upward), intensive peasant farms (1.5 to 2.5 ha) and communes. (1 ha is equal to nearly 2.5 acres). In the mixed farming there is market-gardening, cattle raising for the production of milk and cheese, and poultry raising with production of eggs. In this type of farming, small peasants are dominant, and are bound together in producers' cooperatives.

The cereals are planted by the approximately 10,000 workers of the communes and workers' settlements in the valley of Jezreel and by the peasants in Galilee. Agricultural settlements also exist around Haifa, Petach Tiqva, Kefr Saba and the jewish colonies, the owners of which are also engaged as workers and employees in the city. It appears, however, that these auxiliary enterprises are on the way to becoming basic.

Owing to the large amount of immigration in the last few years, there exists in Palestine an increased demand for soil for agricultural purposes and in the cities for constructions, so that land prices are constantly rising and land speculation has assumed an enormous scope. According to the palestinian (turkish) land law, a fourth of the purchase price must be paid down and the rest in six months. The realty companies accordingly buy up land to the extent of about four times their capital. They then split it up into lots and, as is natural in view of the land hunger, sell it at a very considerable profit, thus being in a position to meet their obligations. When, however, the land hunger has a relapse--as, for example, thru the offer of cheap land and the possibility of exploiting

cheaper labor power on the island of Cyprus, and the companies fail to get the land off their hands, hence are unable to pay the balance due, the amount paid down is forfeited and the purchase lapses. The companies have then lost their capital, and thus arises a possibility of crisis which, in a country where land speculation plays such a dominant part, is bound to have noticeable consequences. The KKL is trying to eliminate speculation, and gives away its farms in perpetual lease. But since this Fund (as well as the KH) exists on gifts and collections, it is unable to keep pace with the land hunger. For the land hunger, like the immigration itself, is a consequence of the increasing impoverishment of the jewish masses and their fear of outright proletarianization. And the continuing impoverishment is bound to exert a restraining influence upon the money collections. Besides, the land is in the possession of the feudal nobility and its prices mount. The money at the disposal of the KKL is inadequate, and the Fund finds itself compelled to promote large land purchases of private companies, in which it acts as an intermediary. Thus speculation wins more and more influence, and the land-hungry masses of the arab and jewish country population are confronted with the task of breaking the chains of the feudal and capitalist property relations.

The most immediate consequence of these conditions is a building boom, which has been in progress in Palestine for several years. A part of the raw materials originates within the country, while lumber and iron are imported. The cement production in Palestine had increased in 1934 to 155,000 tons of which only 700 were exported while an additional 148,000 were imported.

In existence also are numerous brick factories. In line with construction, there developed a large industry for carpentry, locksmith and similar construction work. The form of operation is generally that of the workshop: the proprietor as master and about five workers; modern tools and machines; electricity for power. The constructions are carried out by building contractors, who have a staff of special workers and also engage unskilled workers according to need. The differentiation between skilled and unskilled workers is not as yet very highly developed in Palestine, since of course the jewish proletariat is only beginning to take form and had little technical experience until a few years ago. Even today the technical training, in line with the pressing demand for workers, is still very defective and the waste in production is relatively great. Recently, however, that demand has declined, and there is forming more

and more rapidly an army of unskilled workers who no longer have any prospect, within the existing property relations, of "coming up". And within this army there is also to be found a constant number of unemployed. That is to say: the different individuals get work from time to time, and the duration of the unemployment per man is still slight, but the absolute number remains constant. The panic arising from the italo-abyssinian conflict has had its effect also in this particular, increasing the unemployment. Figures, however, cannot be given since the trade union, which alone would be in a position to represent the unemployment statistically, (obviously for nationalistic reasons) attadhes no value to the matter.

An important role in the construction industry is played also by the workers' cooperatives which appear as enterprisers. They take contracts, carry out the construction works and also engage unskilled workers. All receive the same wage, and the earnings are divided among the members of the cooperative (called kwuza), with the exclusion of the wage workers not belonging to the kwuza. A wage worker can work in the kwuza for only a maximum of three months, after which he must either become a member and pay a contribution, or, since the contribution is usually very high,he is obliged to leave the job. Thus this rule of the trade union has an effect the opposite of that professed: instead of liberating the workers within capitalism from wage labor, it throws them back every three months onto the market. The entire jewish bus transport industry likewise is in the hands of such cooperatives; and owing to the small railway network,the bus lines are highly radiated. With the development of traffic there arose also motor-car works,tho the engines are still imported. Road construction also is carried out on a large scale, mainly by the government, in part also by the communes.

A water main also is under construction from Ras el 'Ain (Jaffa) to Jerusalem. Its length is about 65 kilometers, and it rises from sea level to a height of 800 meters. This work is being carried out for the government by the federation as enterpriser.The Palestine Railways maintain very large repair shops in Haifa. The Palestine Potash Company, an english-jewish concern, has the concession for exploiting the mineral wealth of the Dead Sea, and is a modern large-scale chemical enterprise. Entering upon the premises of the company is, however, strictly forbidden (it is said to be engaged in the manufacture of war toxics). Factories for the production of artificial silk have closed down recently, because it was not possible to

lower the wages of the workers sufficiently and because the working methods could not be further intensified to withstand the japanese competition.

This entire industry is in general powered with electricity except for the rural water pumps, which in part are driven by Diesel engines. All the electric current for Palestine (apart from Jerusalem) is produced by the Palestine Electric Corporation, whose president is the former left social-revolutionary engineer Rutenberg, known for his participation in the execution of the priest Gapon. The company operates the power works with water power and Diesel engines. There is a factory and several smaller workshops for machine construction, and an iron foundry.

Joined onto agriculture is a food industry which makes fruit juices and fruit and vegetable preserves. The fruit juices are especially an important product for the Near East, since Islam forbids the use of alcohol and, owing to the climate, a great demand exists for refreshing drinks. Hence this industry exports its products also into the entire Near East.A special industry is based on olives, mainly of syrian origin; it produces technical oils and fats, salad oils and soap.

The financing is carried out on the one hand, thru the National Fund (purchase of ground and industrialization of agriculture) and, on the other, thru Barclay's Bank and the Anglo-Palestine Bank and its daughter enterprise, the General Mortgage Bank of Palestine. There is also a large number of credit cooperatives (agricultural and industrial) as well as speculative banks. The government bank is Barclay's.

The total value of industrial production in 1933 was 5,400,000 pounds sterling; in 1934 - 6,500,000.

Number of industrial workers: end of 1932 - 9,500; end of 1933 - 14,000; beginning of 1935 - 18,000.The total number of workers, employees, foremen, etc. engaged in the industries at the beginning of 1935 was 25,000. The total number of all jewish workers in the country may have amounted around this time to between 70,000 and 80,000. The wages could not yet be determined; one may assume, however, an average wage of 200 mils or, roughly, $1.00.

The party of the "Revisionists", the fascist party of the Jews, aims to establish the jewish state on both sides of the Jordan (hence also Transjordania.) Its program resembles that of the italian fascists. It advocates class collaboration on the basis of the

jewish tradition. In this they have points of contact with the Misrachi, the jewish clerical party, which watches over the sabbath rest and over religious cooking and education, and which in these respects received at the latest zionist congress far-going concessions from the labor party, which had almost 50% of all the representation, and from the liberal parties. The Revisionists wish to solve the question of the relations of Jews to Arabs in the sense that the Arabs in Palestine shall form a national minority with certain rights of cultural and religious autonomy under control of the jewish state. The Revisionists have withdrawn from the general organization of the Zionists and no longer take part in the congress, but hold a congress of their own. A fraction of them, however, the Jewish State Party, has remained in the general zionist world congress, where it forms the extreme right wing.

Every Jew in Palestine is automatically a member of the Knesset-Jisrael, an organization to which are subordinate the entire jewish educational activity, the jewish church, relief work, etc., and whose executive committee or national council represents the jewish public in dealing with the government.

The Arabs are represented before the government mainly by the Moslem Supreme Council, headed by the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. There are, however, also arab parties which had their origin in the great arab liberation movement and in the arab uprising which in 1917-18, with the support of the English, freed the arab countries from the age-long turkish oppression. But the arab bedouins and urbanites did not yet have the strength to resist the power of english and french imperialism; and these latter are much more clever than the Turks in the matter of ranging the arab countries into their world empires.

The arab parties are not as yet so much distinguished by their programs as by the families at their head. The party of the Mufti and his family, the "Party of the Palestinian People", which receives a bounty of 70,000 pounds from the Moslem Council and owns two daily papers (Al Jamea - Al Shabab), aims at the independence of Palestine and the liquidation of the league-of-nations mandate: "Palestine to the Arabs", entry of Palestine into the union of the arab peoples. It maintains relations with Ibn Saud, the ruler of Hejaz. The party of the Nashashibi family, the "Party of National Defense", a sort of fascist organization which maintains relations with the king of Iraq and the Emir of Transjordania, demands the independence of Palestine, a purely arab national government, and

wants to promote the development of agriculture. It has three daily newspapers (Falastin, Al Aslamiah, Adifa). A "reform party" under the leadership of Dr. Khaldis, the mayor of Jerusalem, unites the mayors and village directors of many arab communities. This organization seems to be the most modern of the arab parties and has more similarity with the party forms known from Europe. It demands the independence of Palestine in the pan-arab league of states and an alliance agreement with the English, similar to the anglo-iraq league. It rejects religious separatism between islamic and christian Arabs and combats Zionism. The arab youth organization, led by Jacob Bey Dissin, sets border guards against the illegal jewish immigration, combats in the villages the sale of land to Jews and has connections with the egyptian national circles. It was also connected with Chilmi Pasha, who founded a private bank called the "Bank of the Arab People", in order to finance purely arab land transactions. The Bank of the Arab People could not, however, overcome the distrust of the arab people and went bankrupt.

There are two arab trade-union organizations, concerning which, however, little is to be learned. They are said to be conducted, on the one hand, by Jacob Bey Dissin, and on the other by Chilmi or Nashashibi, to be in vigorous competition among each other and to be a collecting center for the political parties in question. At any rate, they appear to be completely under the influence of the arab bourgeoisie.

The General Federation of Jewish Labor in Palestine (Histadrut), which is affiliated with the Amsterdam International, had increased its membership (Jan. 1, 1935) to 67,562 of which about 45,000 were urban workers.

The normal working day in Palestine is eight hours. The average wage in urban construction amounts to 400 mils per day (about $2.00); in village construction, less. The building trades pay the highest wages.

The Histadrut publishes a daily newspaper, the "Davar" which also includes an evening edition and, every two weeks, a children's paper. All these publications appear exclusively in the hebrew language (and script). Thus it comes about that to a large part of the workers, who speak nothing but Yiddish, the publications of their organization are almost or quite unintelligible. And so the workers are compelled to sit once more at the school bench in order to learn the difficult language and the almost undecipherable script. (While in countries where the latin alphabet is em-

ployed, the children learn to read and write in one year, here the process extends over about four years.)

In the year 1934 the Histadrut conducted a total of 68 strikes (in Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa and the agricultural colonies), involving 1104 workers and the loss of 11,403 working days, and 51 of which were won. In 34 cases the Revisionists attempted to break the strike, and in six cases were successful. The strikes led to five prosecutions in which 34 workers were sentenced to a total of 33 months imprisonment and forced labor, and to fines of 220 pounds. The Histadrut also supported eight arab strikes in which 785 workers walked out for a total of 4145 days. Two of these strikes were won.

The Histadrut controls the entire jewish labor market. There are neither state nor city employment bureaus, nor is there any unemployment relief. The Histadrut supplies the workers to the employers who thereby recognize the rates of pay. The employers are furthermore combined in their own unions which, however, do not as yet possess any general organization. On the other hand, the Histadrut is generally in a position to force acceptance of the wage rate, in which connection the relatively slight unemployment, the still prevailing lack of specialized workers and the relatively low wages exert a favorable effect. Nor is the jewish bourgeoisie in a position simply to exploit the cheaper arab labor power, because there is not so much skilled arab labor on hand and the jewish working class is said to offer a certain political protection with respect to the Arabs. In the rural districts, on the plantations, the matter is different. Here the exploited labor force is made up in large part of arab workers, who are experienced and cheap, though their wages also have gone up considerably. In spite of the fact that the Histadrut is fighting very vigorously, by way of picketing, against the influx of arab workers onto the plantations, it cannot prevent the planters from continuing to employ such workers (mostly former fellahs) nor prevent these arab workers from becoming familiar with the forms of trade-union struggle, which they now and then put to good use. The Histadrut has even gone so far as to combat an enterprise in Tel-Aviv where a revolutionary arab worker was employed. When the workers of this enterprise declared their sympathy with the arab comrade, a brawl arose between these workers and the trade-union functionaries, and a process was instituted with a view to debarring the workers from the Histadrut. Exclusion from the Histadrut is equivalent to losing the possibility of working; for while officially the Histadrut obtains work for all workers,

still the protectionism in vogue is such that opposi-
tional or excluded workers get none. In this respect,
the Histadrut may be regarded as a state organization.
In most cases it can see that workers who are not in
its organization are no longer employed by any enter-
prise .

To the Histadrut is attached a general sick benefit
fund which has the disposal over hospitals, recrea-
tion homes and good physicians. The Histadrut builds
workers' settlements and blocks of dwellings in which
workers' families acquire homes which, thru install-
ment payments, become their private property.

The predominant faction in the Histadrut is the Labor
Party (MAPAI). It has about 6000 members and is loose-
ly attached to the Second International. It has, be-
sides, in the various countries where Jews reside,af-
filiated groups (Palestine League for Labor.) It is
still more nationalistic than the other parties adher-
ing to this International. It fills all offices in
the Histadrut where it reigns in absolute fashion;the
more so as the functionaries are appointed by the
governing board.

The "Hashomer Hazair", originally a jewish youth or-
ganization widely disseminated in Eastern Europe, is
increasingly acquiring in Palestine the features of
a party. Hitherto, however, it has embraced only
such working men and women as live in the country on
labor communes (so-called Kwuzots). The kwuzots want
to actualize socialist life in this way: that first
with the aid of loans from the KKL and KH and on the
basis of common purchase and sale, common cooking and
common education of the children, they till their own
soil and engage no wage workers.

The party which goes by the name of the "Left Poale
Zion", with about 250 members in Palestine and var-
ious groups in other countries, especially in the
U.S.A. and Poland, forms the opposition within the
Histadruth, demanding democratization of the appara-
tus and equal right of the arab workers to organize.
Its final goal is a soviet Palestine. It is national-
istic insofar as it demands the formation of a jewish
labor center in Palestine. The LPZ is at one with the
other zionist parties on the point that an assimila-
tion of the jewish middle strata and proletarians in
the countries of the Diaspora--even in the Soviet
Union which is regarded as the first stage of com-
munism--is impossible. They insist that after the
abolition of private property and of the State a
stage must be passed thru in which there is given to
the nations on their own territories the possibility

of their cultural development. It does not take part, however, in the zionist congress. Its general standpoint is that of the Comintern to which it does not adhere because of the difference on the jewish question.

The illegal communist party of Palestine (PCP) consists of about 100 jewish members who in part are disappointed former members of the Hashomer Hazair. Since it conceives its main goal to be the weakening of english imperialism, it combats the jewish immigration, by which it finds that imperialism strengthened. On the other hand, it supports every arab national movement. It esteems the pogroms of the past few years as national-revolutionary uprisings; and with respect to the italian-abyssinian conflict it advocates the People's Front of the arab people with its leaders, the effendis, and recommends the forming of arab legions to go to Abyssinia and there combat italian fascism. The PCP is taking great pains to arabize its organization. It is the only organization which has come out for the payment of unemployment relief.

The Anti-fascist Action ("Antifa"), adhering to the world committee in Paris, has about 500 members and is under the leadership of the LPZ. It is supposed to be the foundation of the united-front movement for struggle against fascism, imperialism and anti-semitism. Anyone can become a member, excepting members of the PCP; these latter being excluded because they combat jewish immigration, while the Antifa and the LPZ take the view that the creation of a jewish proletariat in Palestine will represent a force which cannot fail to operate against imperialism and that the combatting of the right of free immigration and taking root of the jewish workers in Palestine is chauvinistic. The Antifa as well as the LPZ want to combat the jewish chauvinism of the Mapai, Histadruth and Revisionists together with the arab chauvinism of the PCP. They champion freedom of the mother tongues and form circles in which Yiddish, German, etc., are spoken.

The situation in Palestine has recently changed. The "prosperity" described above has receded almost simultaneously with the outbreak of the abyssinian-italian conflict. Unemployment has grown and with it the uncertainty and the discontent within the working class. Since the PCP was the only organization to come out for the payment of unemployment relief, it succeeded in improving its standing among the unemployed. The other labor parties and the Histadruth were unable to come out for unemployment relief, mainly because they feared that the english government would in that case greatly restrict jewish immigration.

The Histadruth intensified its struggle for weeding out arab workers from jewish production; and the LPZ which for a time had sought to find a common basis with the PCP on the unemployment question, saw itself compelled, in order to reestablish its zionist renown, to conduct a sharp struggle against the PCP. The Histadruth, which hitherto had simply denied the existence of unemployment, is now trying to appease its members with so-called constructive means. That is, it calls upon the workers to pay a contribution into an unemployment fund. From this fund, money will be turned over to the cooperatives and also to private enterprisers for the purpose of "extra work-making". And from the same fund, workers who work in return for arab wages will be paid the difference between these latter and the jewish wage rate.

The sharpening of the arab-jewish relations, beginning in April 1936, which led to guerilla warfare and to an arab strike, covered over the social unrest of the working class with a lively and warlike national sentiment. On both sides the masses were organized for "self-protection and defense". This self-protection was participated in, on the jewish side, by the members of <u>all</u> the organizations. The various parties in their appeals laid the blame for the clashes either upon the Arabs or else on the competing parties. It is only to be observed that in this situation not a single organization sought to conduct the struggle against its own bourgeoisie.

The nationalism of the jewish workers, like that of the russian, german, french and other proletariat, is an indication of the drawing back before revolutionary, international tasks. The creation of the "jewish homeland" can only be brought about chauvinistically. The zionist solution of the jewish question can be accomplished only in combat against the Arabs. And, for that matter, the jewish fascists come out openly for this struggle, while the others accept it by keeping their mouths shut or giving utterance to hypocritical phrases. The Jews themselves cannot fulfill the zionist desires, but are compelled to become allies of english imperialism. English imperialism makes use of the arab-jewish oppositions for its own purposes. Zionism becomes an instrument of the english struggle against the strivings for national independence on the part of the Arabs. Under the conditions of Palestine, Zionism can only come forth in capitalistic garb. The Jews are obliged to be capitalistic in order to be nationalistic, and they have to be nationalistic in order to be Zionists. They are obliged to be not only capitalistic, but capitalistic in an extremely reactionary form. As a minority, they cannot be

democratic without damage to their own interests;and being land-hungry, they have to take a position against agrarian reform, binding themselves with the arab feudalists against the fellahs. They are not only reactionary themselves, but they lend force to the arab reaction. The fellahs are driven from the soil which the effendis sell to the Jews. That part of the soil remaining to the effendi is turned into plantations, the fellahs become wage laborers. The furthering of capitalism in Palestine and the sharpening of capitalist oppositions by way of Zionism are revolutionizing, but only in the same sense as the whole of capitalism is revolutionizing; it is no concern of the working population. The working class can only take note of the matter and thru its own intrusions into the process, thru the representation of its direct economic interests as wage workers, help to drive it forward. The sharpening of capitalist oppositions lies in the interest of the proletariat, but it cannot side either with the Arabs or with the Jews; it can take up neither for the division of the soil nor for its control thru the feudal masters or jewish societies. It can only be completely internationalistic and thus completely immune to all palestinian conflicts.It has to attack the most immediate direct exploiter without regard for the consequences on the national plane. As soon as it does more than that, it represents these or those capitalist interests. Anyone who is a Zionist must, especially now with the setting in of the crisis and with the growth of unemployment in Palestine, go along the whole way to Fascism. On the basis of Zionism, the increasingly impoverished "poor whites" become more and more race-conscious, and copy against the Arabs what Hitler has undertaken against the Jews in Germany. The Arabs can answer only in the same fashion. Any other kind of Zionism than this fascist one cannot exist. From the conditions in Palestine today the Jews must learn to comprehend that they are yielding to illusions when they think to be able in Palestine to evade the class struggles of capitalism. They must learn to comprehend that it is very much a matter of indifference where they put up, that everywhere, and inclusive of Palestine, they have only one task: that of setting aside the capitalist relations. All other problems are imaginary ones; they are of no concern to the working class.

TEL - AVIV

-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-

-o-o-o-

-o-

THE MASTERS OF TOMORROW (#)

I

Sometimes a single gesture may unwittingly give away the whole show. In his eagerness to heap as many arguments as possible against "the reflections of Max Nomad", P.M. borrows from a source from which ordinary prudence should have told him to keep away. But he throws all caution to the winds and quotes approvingly a "jocular" remark made by a certain Jerome who, in the theoretical organ of the American Communist Party, has boldly stated that "the dictatorship of the intellectuals is as unthinkable as the dictatorship of traveling salesmen". It did not occur to P.M. that he was identifying himself with the special pleading of a hired lickspittle of the new Russian nobility whose rule is nothing but the dictatorship of the office-holding, administrative and technical intelligentsia; and that his fellow-champion of Marxist orthodoxy who called me "a pen-mercenary of fascism" - if offered a higher price by Hearst - would

---

(#) It was impossible for the present writer to discuss all the topics touched upon by the author of Dictatorship of the Intellectuals. It would have taken a full sized volume to refute all his assertions with which I disagree. I, therefore, chose only those points which I considered as the most essential. I disregarded the amenities of his personal tone with their "subtle" abuse and amusing air of omniscient superiority. I wish, however, to protest specifically against one particular instance of his polemic methods dealing not with matters of opinion or interpretation but with actual facts. P.M. declares as "groundless" the "whole story" that Bismarck in pursuance of his state socialist (or state capitalist) plans, had solicited the support of Marx and of his closest associates. In the first place, I did not claim, as P.M. seems to insinuate, that this was "a proof of the compatibility of Marxism with state capitalism". In an article dealing with State Socialism and State Capitalism this was adduced as evidence of Bismarck's state socialist tendencies. In the second place, my "groundless" assertion is based upon a full-length story by Wilhelm Liebknecht, one of Marx's closest associates, told in his Kein Kompromiss, kein Wahlbundnis (p.8) which, in condensed form, I had presented in my Marx biography published in Scribner's, March, 1933, page 190.

(P.M.'s article appeared in C.C.# 7)

just as brilliantly prove that "a dictatorship of capitalists is just as unthinkable as the dictatorship of pants-pressers".

P.M. betrays the weakness of his position in many other ways. He claims that I do not "clearly delimit" my "concept of the intellectuals". And it is on the strength of this accusation that he flings at me that joke about the "traveling salesmen". As a matter of dry fact, I did "clearly delimit" my concept of the intellectuals on the very first page of my "Rebels and Renegades." There I wrote that the term 'intellectual' was used by me "in the specifically economic sense of a stratum deriving its livelihood from mental occupations." Which certainly includes a great variety of people, such as office-holders, teachers, professional men, technicians, clergymen, commercial and financial experts, journalists, writers, artists, politicians, professional revolutionists and agitators, trade union organizers and so on; all this vast crowd of educated or semi-educated people that may or may not have a college degree but can make a livelihood without resorting to manual or lower clerical labor.

I repeated that very same concept over and over again when speaking of "office-holders, managers and engineers"; of "the owners of education, the lords of the swivel chair and the desk"; of the "privileged employees of the capitalists and the bourgeois state"; only occasionally, to avoid repetition, I used somewhat less precise expressions, such as the "new middle class" and the "educated lower middle classes". It is not my fault if P.M. could not find out (couldn't he really?) what I actually meant. Even ordinary bourgeois reviewers understood perfectly well to whom I was referring. I certainly did not mean the "middle class in general", and if I used the expression "middle class" then I did so in the usual connotation, and not in that of "the new middle class" which largely coincides with the conception of the "privileged employees", and not with the small property-holders.

Sometimes scions of the prosperous capitalists, of the "privileged employees" or of the lower middle classes (in Marxian language called "petty bourgeoisie"), and sometimes self-educated upstart workers, the intellectuals are divided into various income groups, just as the property holders are. Some of them, the "ins", are satisfied with the existing system; others, the "outs", the underpaid or unemployed, are just as strenuously opposed to it. The "ins" devour an enormous part of the national wealth; they enjoy a bourgeois standard

of living, and in their large mass are always ready to side with the existing system against the manual workers.

In short, formally "employees", the "ins" are in fact, due to their higher educational qualifications, minor partners of the capitalists as a whole;the lesser nobility, as it were, within the great bourgeois aristocracy of the modern age. And in proportion as the major partner, the capitalist, becomes a mere consuming parasite, leaving most of the functions of technical and commercial management to his "paid employees" - in the same proportion these "employees" become the potential successors of their employers. But, being satisfied with their social position, they are naturally a conservative element; they are not in a hurry to dispossess their masters (or major partners); for any serious interference with the property relations may disturb the social peace and endanger their own privileged incomes.

In writing about the various mass movements, I was of course dealing chiefly with the "outs", the unemployed or underpaid journalists, lecturers, college graduates and undergraduates, "lawyers without clients and doctors without patients" (Marx), educated ex-workers in search of a white-collar position - in short, all that motley army of impecunious or starving intellectuals, near-intellectuals and would-be-intellectuals, that is dissatisfied with the existing system and is very often militantly active in the various radical or fascist movements. It is this group which, in my opinion, has the ambition of eliminating the capitalist class of parasitic consumers, and of establishing its own rule in a system based on government ownership and an unequal distribution of incomes.

I admit that, to support my thesis, I have largely resorted to adducing the Russian example. For that system has evolved an enormous hierarchy of intellectuals who are bureaucrats at the same time: administrative office-holders, technical managers and engineers, savants, journalists, professors, writers, Marx-theologians, army officers, scientific spies, trade-union and sports organizers - who owe their bourgeois comfort to the labor of the uneducated workers and peasants.

Faced by this crushing example, P.M. has resorted to a very ingenuous argument. Russia, he says, is just a capitalist state in which the bureaucrats are the capitalists. The rest of the population, intellectuals, workers, peasants, are subject to that new capitalist class, just as they are subject to the capital-

ists in any other country. Thus, there is a capitalist dictatorship in Russia, and therefore it is preposterous to talk of a domination by intellectuals.

You don't believe it? Here it is in his own words: "the group of people who has the sole right of disposal over production" are "not the intellectuals but the State bureaucracy, which of course also embraces intellectuals", "the Russian intellectuals are dominated by the Russian bureaucracy, just as in other countries they are dominated by capital"(page 25); "no trace of a rule by intellectuals is discoverable under either system. The intellectuals are nowhere identical with the State" (page 26); "the Russian bureaucracy is at the same time the Russian capitalist class, since it fulfills the capitalist functions". (page 27).

Yet only a few pages earlier (page 17) when speaking of the antagonism between workers and intellectuals which he had to admit, he had said: "The struggle of the workers against the intellectuals (in the capitalist countries-M.N.) could practically be only a struggle against the labor bureaucracy; or, as today in Russia, a struggle against the State bureaucracy";and further, on the same page: "It is not until and unless a state capitalist revolution has been successful, (which apparently means only Russia-M.N.) it is only then that the struggle against the bureaucracy and hence against the intellectuals (my emphasis-M.N.)is taken up again with redoubled fierceness". So there is "no trace of a domination by intellectuals" who are "dominated by the Russian bureaucracy", and yet the workers will have to take up "the struggle against the bureaucracy and hence against the intellectuals". On page 27 the bureaucrats are the "capitalists", and on page 17 they are the "intellectuals".

Now, what is the meaning of "bureaucracy"? Any dictionary will supply the information that it means "Government officials collectively". In Russia,where every branch of the country's economic and cultural life is managed by the Government, every man who is not a peasant or a manual worker, is a government office-holder, a member of the bureaucracy,no matter whether he is a judge, a political administrator, a factory manager, an engineer or a chemist, a higher transport or postal employee, a journalist,an actor, a singer, professor, trade union organizer, army officer or bank accountant; a certain amount of education or training exceeding the average educational level of the manual worker guarantees him a soft job and a salary which is above the average wage of a manual worker. (One may disregard here the "border

cases", such as the lower grades of the office-workers, typists, filing clerks, etc., who generally are closer to the workers both by their educational level and by their income. There are similar "border cases" between small capitalist employers and workers as well). All of these groups are at the same time bureaucrats and intellectuals - the intellectuals, as a social group, simply becoming the bureaucrats of a system with a government-owned economy.

Once this is the case, it is rather comical to say that in Russia the intellectuals are ruled by the bureaucrats; one might just as well say that in the United States the property-owners are ruled by the capitalists, or that under the feudal system the nobility was ruled by the aristocracy. One may, of course, say quite correctly that in Russia the means of production are owned by the bureaucrats as a whole, who benefit by them at the expense of the rest of the population. But this would be exactly the confirmation of my thesis: that under a system of government-ownership the intellectuals as a whole, forming the state bureaucracy, are the masters of the country.

Now, to suit his argument, P.M. simply draws a dividing class line between the upper and the lower levels within the same class. To him the bureaucrats are only the super-commissars and trust managers who give orders and are rewarded with Rolls Royces and villas in the Caucasus or in the Crimea. The middle and lower grades of the political, technical and cultural state apparatus, the plain intellectuals with only a Buick or Chevrolet to their soul, with a modest country house for the summer, and only one servant - these unfortunates, who can give orders to the workers only and must carry out the instructions of the higher-ups, are of an altogether different class substance: they are the oppressed and exploited "employees", "intellectuals" - maybe even "proletarians" ? - suffering under the yoke of a small number of bureaucratic-capitalist leviathans.

Those to whom such pleading sounds convincing should be reminded that the same methods could be applied to the capitalists as well. In America it is only the managing boards of a few hundred concerns - and that number could be even still more reduced - which actually direct the destinies of the country; the average or small manufacturer or business man is at the mercy of the Rockefellers, the Morgans or the Du Ponts; as a result, he usually hates those capitalist demi-gods just as much as the average Russian intellectual-bureaucrat detests his superior - whose place he would like to take. Yet there is in both cases a common bond

of interest between the top and the middle - as against the mass of workers and peasants.

P.M. tries to prove his thesis that a "dictatorship of the intellectuals" is impossible by the assertion that "the majority of the intellectuals has always gone along with capital and still today goes with the ruling class". The fact is that the majority of every oppressed or "under-privileged" class under "normal" conditions is always under the sway of the ideology of the masters; it is only under exceptional, revolutionary circumstances that it joins the determined rebellious minority. Ever growing sections of the more enlightened part of the intelligentsia in non-Fascist Europe and America are flocking now to the various Marxist (#) parties; they see in the Russian example the possibility of putting an end to their economic insecurity, the hope of throwing off the financial magnates, and the prospect of becoming masters of the country themselves. They are the pioneers of their class. Even among the fascist intellectuals - as will be shown later - there is a tendency towards a sort of super-totalitarianism under which the state, that is the bureaucracy, would altogether do away with the private capitalists.

Of course large groups of well-paid "ins" among the intellectuals will to the very last remain faithful to the private capitalist system; but so will likewise certain "proletarian" elements, such as policemen, body-guards, flunkeys, foremen, highly skilled workers, municipal laborers and other "civil servants" with steady jobs who are satisfied with the existing system.

In Russia the "specialists" remained enemies of the Bolshevik regime until they lost all hope that the private capitalist system would ever come back. Under the old system they were so well paid that they preferred to be "privileged employees" rather than equal or minor partners of a new political bureaucracy which was forced to clip their salaries. In a similar way part of the capitalist class, especially high finance, under certain conditions, prefers the feudal or semi-feudal system to bourgeois democracy, if the former gives their special group the opportunity of enriching itself at the expense of the other capitalists. The old Russian bureaucratic intelligentsia was naturally counter-revolutionary, for it felt that the Bolsheviks would take away their soft jobs and rele-

---

(#) It is not correct that the Communist Parties are on the wane; their influence is now growing in France, Belgium, Spain, U.S.A., etc.

gate them to minor posts. The Bolshevik revolution began with a dictatorship of a specific group of intellectuals - the most active militants of the revolutionary upheaval - which exercized its dictatorship even over the other groups of intellectuals; and as long as there was not enough to satisfy everybody, they were getting all the good things exclusively for themselves. But gradually, with the development of the country's industries, they were able to improve the position of the other sections of the intelligentsia as well, thus eventually weaning them away from their traditional subservience to the old private capitalist ideology.

In denying that the intellectuals are capable of engaging in any policy corresponding to their own class interests, P.M. falls back upon the old theory that consciousness is determined by our surroundings, that we are all blind manikins in the hands of inexorable economic forces, and so forth. We have heard these things before. Nobody denies that consciousness does not work in a vacuum and that more often than not we are pushed where we think we are pushing. But there is such a thing as going a little bit too far in the denial of the role of consciousness. During the War, the bourgeoisie the world over, to avoid utter defeat, did introduce the element of conscious planning into the economic life of their respective countries; the forcible collectivization of Russian farming was a conscious act of a bureaucracy bent upon fortifying its position. In both cases the economic <u>interest</u> of the acting classes involved was the driving force, which is what you call the <u>human</u> factor, and not the "objective" or "extra-human" element of the growth of the social forces of production.

It is this economic interest which early in the nineteenth century induced an energetic minority among the intellectuals and self-taught workers to join various radical democratic and revolutionary movements;and it is the same economic interest which in the present hopeless economic situation has made them consciously turn towards Socialism-Communism or towards Fascism, as a short cut to power.

P.M. makes a very sweeping statement (p.23) to the effect that "apart from the Russian example, there is as yet no case and no country in which a political bureaucracy, with the conquest of political power, ruled society also economically." Well, that "apart of the Russian example" is amusing enough, for that example alone proves <u>that it can be done</u>. But there are also other historical examples. K.A.Wittfogel in his "Das Erwachende China" (p.16) shows how in old

agricultural China the necessity of regulating the flow of the big rivers has created "a powerful water distributing (literally "Wasserbau") bureaucracy" which was the Chinese "master class". And on pp.24-26 he shows how after the abolition of feudalism the "administrative bureaucracy" became not only the "ruling class", but in fact, though not formally, the collective owner of the entire land, the taxes which they squeezed out of the peasants being "in this case identical with ground rent."After that it is only as the merest curious detail that I may mention the famous "communism" of the Jesuits in Paraguay in the eighteenth century, where the monks - a sort of clerico-fascist intellectuals of 200 years ago - owned and ruled economically and politically the whole country, the Indian natives slaving for them "communistically."

With an attempt at sarcasm P.M. writes that the intellectuals as a social group "cannot proceed independently - it cannot do Nomad the pleasure of finding his predictions confirmed" (p.23). And he points to the fact that there is no solidarity among them, while the workers are forced to practice solidarity; that the intellectuals are ready to flirt either with Stalin or with Mussolini and to turn for support today to the working class and tomorrow to the capitalists. Here again his argumentation does not hold water. Independent action is no special characteristic of a class and no special requirment for being victorious. The bourgeoisie in its struggle against the feudals, leaned upon the workers and the peasants; it is just as ready now, when threatened by the workers, to unite with the feudals, or with the clergy, the intellectuals of the feudal age, so to speak.Similarly, the intellectuals, to get power or political influence, are ready to take their allies wherever they can find them, prepared to betray any of them if by so doing they can consolidate their power.

Nor is solidarity a specific characteristic of a class. No class ever practices solidarity within its ranks, except under very pressing and extraordinary circumstances Normally one-half of the working class is ready to scab on the other half; before and during the War the A.F.L. workers made it their business to scab on striking I.W.W. workers; and the I.W.W., in comprehensible resentment, occasionally retaliated. In Europe socialist workers would often act in a similar way against their more radical dissenters. One group of capitalists is always engaged in cutting the throats of another group, and various groups of capitalists are interested in various forms of government. No wonder then that one group of intellectuals--

Fascists or Communists as the case might be--in its ambition to monopolize all the good jobs, is ready to exterminate the other group.

True, the interests of the workers, as the ~~up~~ thermost class, may eventually compel them to practice solidarity against all their exploiters, while the oligarchical tendencies within each exploiting or potentially exploiting group make for continuous dissension among them. But in this respect, the various quarrelling clans of power - hungry intellectuals are no different from those of all the other exploiting classes, past or present, whether capitalists or land-holders.

Do I have to dwell upon such "inaccuracies" - to put it mildly - as the one where P.M. says that "the intellectuals have no economic functions" (p.34). It is simply amazing how anybody can say such a thing in the present phase of capitalism, when the capitalist, in most cases, has become a pure parasite, fulfilling merely the "function" of owning and consuming, while the intellectuals are in charge of all the aspects of economic and technical management, political administration and cultural leadership of the entire capitalist system!

II - FASCISM AND BOLSHEVISM

The aspirations and appetites of the intellectual "outs" can find their expression and satisfaction in various "ideologies", in "proletarian" Marxism, in the aristocratic Paretism of the Italian Fascists, or in the race gospel of the Nazis. Just as the capitalist bourgeoisie under different circumstances can embrace the Voltairian iconoclasm of the French Republic, or the medieval emperor-god worship of a militarist semi-absolutism, Japanese style.

The fascists in power are not just flunkeys of the capitalists, as P.M. seems to believe in touching harmony with Trotsky ("The Social Structure of the Soviet State"). They are their major partners; they are swallowing up an ever growing share of the nation's wealth; and while in some countries they are now greatly favoring their munition magnates, their taxes and assessments are impoverishing the bourgeoisie as a whole in order to feed an enormous bureaucratic machine. That machine does not stand "above the classes" (#-see bottom of next page) ; it is both a "protector" of the rich and their blackmailing parasite at the same time; largely comparable to the Praetorians of the Roman Empire, who, while permitting

the property-owners to exist, actually were the masters of the country and lived at the expense of all the other classes of the population. Of, if another example is still necessary, there is the Japanese officers' caste, now in possession of Manchuria, which not only rules the country politically and robs it by taxation, as do the Fascists in Italy, but has also taken over the economic management and exploitation of most of the country's resources - not for the Japanese millionaires on the Island Empire, but for the army, that is, for itself. They are certainly not the flunkeys of the Chinese-Manchu capitalists, nor of the Japanese multimillionaires whose most prominent representatives they are in the habit of "bumping off" from time to time...

Undoubtedly the fascist state bureaucracy also rules over other groups of intellectuals. But what of it? The large feudals also ruled over the smaller nobles, just as the financial sharks do over the smaller capitalists, and the higher clergy over their minor brethren. Under the oligarchical principle inherent to all systems of domination, a minority within each ruling class always gets the best morsels with the additional seasoning of the greatest display of power.

P.M. asserts that fascism "would never have come to power" if it were at all possible that the fascists could turn on the capitalists. Has he never heard of mercenaries of various sorts, Mamettines,Praetorians, Mamelukes, Condottieri, of all times and all countries, who would become the masters of those who hired them? Do I have to remind him of the fact that there is an openly anti-capitalist wing within the Italian fascist party which recommends "the Road to Msocow";i.e. the expropriation of the capitalists; and that in the opinion of those familiar with the situation, Mussolini, if driven to a corner, will not hesitate to turn Bolshevik, if by so doing he can save the rule of his party - the party of the most determined and energetic

---

(#) The Fascists of Italy have repeatedly forced the capitalists to increase wages,to shorten hours and even to take on numbers of unemployed workers. They did it at moments when they thought it necessary by some "anti-capitalist" gesture to win the allegiance of the workers,or,as in the case of the unemployed, for the purpose of reducing their fiscal expenses, preferring,as they did, to use the Treasury for the needs of the bureaucracy. If P.M. says that such a thing is "objectively not possible" and that "nothing of the sort has so far happened",he simply chooses to deny facts which in their time were generally reported in the newspapers.

section of the intelligentsia. (#)

If a large part of the intellectuals in various countries, instead of turning socialist or communist, joins the fascist ranks, it does so largely for the same reason for which many workers likewise don the black or brown shirt. No doubt, the influence of reactionary ideology plays a certain part in the process. But it is largely their impatience, their desire for a short cut to power, that is respensible for the success of the new gospel. Many of the fascist intellectuals would join the Communist movement, if they saw that it had any chances, or at least intentions of winning immediately. For by now it has become obvious to most observers that the leading Communists of the non-fascist countries have ceased to be revolutionaries at all; that ever since 1923 they have become ordinary Russian patriots abrcad, actually opposed to any revolutionary steps that might disturb the international status quo in which the U.S.S.R. has been interested for many years. Like the socialists of prewar times the Communists - meaning of course the official leadership - have become a party of anti-capitalist protest and not of anti-capitalist revolt.

Over and over again P.M. repeats the Stalinist thesis that Fascism is just the expression of the needs of monopoly capital "in order to maintain the capitalist system at all." A glance at what actually happened - and why it happened - in Italy and Germany, the two main fascist countries, would show that it simply is not so. It was not the necessity of saving the capitalist system - either from the proletarian menace or from its internal weakness - that brought about fascism in Italy. The first menace had been taken care of by the socialists themselves, when the jitters experienced by the bourgeoisie during the near-revolution of 1920 induced the capitalists to enter that alliance with Mussolini's bands which they later regretted when it was too late. For whatever the fascists gave them by cowing the workers, they took from the capitalists by their various direct or indirect exactions for the maintenance of the government machine. Italian capitalism and its profits would have survived without Mussolini as well.

Nor does Germany serve as a confirmation of the official communist thesis which P.M. so readily accepts. This is not the place for repeating all the circum-

---

(#) There is no longer any secret about Mussolini's original intention of becoming Italy's Lenin, and that he chose his other road to power only because the breach between him and his former comrades could no longer be bridged.

stances which hoisted Hitler into power. Only dogmatic blindness, judging according to set formulas, could assert that the Weimar Republic, or a combination of Weimarism with Bruening's or Schleicher's semi-constitutionalism, would not have just as well done the job of saving German capitalism.

In either case - and this likewise includes a number of smaller states of the more or less undeveloped Balkan or Latin-American type - it was not the existence of capitalism that was at stake. In many of the countries with fascist, military-fascist or near-fascist dictatorships there is practically no modern capitalism at all, and even no big landed property either; practically all the exploitation being done in what one could call the old Chinese method described by Wittfogel: taxation of the small property holders for the sake of a parasitic bureaucratic and military apparatus. It is for the possession of the soft jobs in the civil service and in the officers' caste that struggles are waged there between the various groups of "outs" and "ins". In the industrially more developed countries fascist tendencies are the result of the cooperation between specific groups of capitalists who see in fascism a greater guarantee for the increase of their profits, and certain ruined and therefore adventurous sections of the new middle classes. In these countries the existence of capitalism itself is not affected, whether these machinations are successful or not.

The Stalinists' insistence upon the thesis about fascism-and-monopoly-capitalism is obvious enough. For years they have been repeating that the Trotskyists are the "advance-guard of counter-revolutionary intervention" (no joking); until two years ago they have made hundreds of thousands of innocents believe that the Socialists are "social-fascists", or, as Stalin put it "twin-brothers of fascism." So this was just another "gag" in their inexhaustible arsenal of abuse that is always calculated to hide the real issues. Heinz Neumann, a leading German Communist who, after the catastrophe of 1933, for awhile engaged in independent thinking, finally began to mutter something about the dictatorship of the "Lumpenproletariat": he actually meant the declasse intellectuals and semi-intellectuals. He was severely called down and punished by his masters in Moscow; for if the German semi-intellectual "down-and-outers" were able to seize power and to hold it as major partners of the German capitalists, then some people might become suspicious that it was a similar group of declasse intellectuals and semi-intellectuals who seized all the power in Russia and has been holding it until now

under the guise of a "proletarian dictatorship".

P.M. docilely accepts the Bolshevik thesis as to fascist identity with finance capital. And as if to make up for this suspicious harmony of opinions, he supplements it with another theory according to which the house built by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin is nothing but a form of capitalism, subject to the same laws of motion as any other capitalist system. He consistently speaks of "State Capitalism", a term that many writers, including the undersigned as well, have loosely applied to the Russian system.

Now to be theoretically exact, it is not admissible to apply the old terminology to the new Russian reality. An economic system whose means of production are socialized, or "bureaucratized" which is the same, no longer falls under the category of capitalism. It is "capitalism" only inasmuch as "capitalism" is accepted as identical with "exploitation". But the two terms are <u>not</u> identical. Capitalism, of course, necessarily involves exploitation; but there were forms of exploitation which could not be called capitalistic. (#)

According to the best Marxist authorities which P.M. certainly recognizes, capitalism no longer exists where there is <u>only one owner</u>; and the Russian State, that is, the bureaucracy, is only <u>one sole firm</u>,so to speak. At the end of his book <u>Das Akkumulations-und Zusammenbruchs-Gesetz</u>, the well-known Marxist Professor Henryk Grossmann analyzes the idea whether capitalism could eventually assume the form of a "General-Kartell", i.e., of a One-Big-Trust system. He denies this possibility and declares that, once matters have gotten to that point, capitalism will not exist any longer and its place will have been taken "either by a plain system of domination (Grossmann uses the expression "offenes Herrschaftsverhaltnis" which it is difficult to translate literally - M.N.) as in the Middle Ages (which may mean only the relation of the feudal lord to his serfs) or a socialist commonwealth (sozialistische Gemeinwirtschaft)".

As a good old Socialist, with sympathies for the U.S.S.R., Grossmann was reluctant to dwell in greater de-

---

(#) The immense majority of readers still identifies the concept of <u>socialism</u> with the <u>absence of exploitation</u> - an assumption which is altogether wrong.It was precisely for the purpose of indicating the <u>exploiting</u> essence of Soviet Russia's economic system that in my previous writings I used the term of State <u>Capitalism.</u>But the term "unequalitarian socialism" would be more appropriate.

tail upon this alternative. He apparently felt that he was on dangerous ground for, as far as the present writer knows from personal conversation with him, the professor refuses to commit himself as to the character of the Russian social system and calls it vaguely a "proletarian state". Had he disregarded these personal sympathies, he would have had to state that what followed upon the elimination of private capitalism in Russia was a combination of both "socialism" and "Herrschaftsverhältnis".

For, paradoxical as it may sound to some readers, exploitation is just as much possible under socialism as under any other previous social system. If one were to indulge in prophesying one could make a guess that the coming form of human exploitation, as foreshadowed by Russia's system of government ownership and inequality of incomes, will simply be called <u>socialism</u>, and that in the ears of the underdog this word will assume the same connotation of master-and-slave relationship as feudalism and capitalism.

Theoretically speaking, the essence of socialism has always been merely <u>government ownership of the means of production,</u> even if that substance is sometimes presented more attractively as an "association of free and equal producers," a term that is as vague as so many other traditional socialist slogans. In other words, socialism means primarily a change in the form of <u>production</u>, or in the ownership of the <u>means of production.</u> The question of distribution has always been considered as a secondary matter, after the first and most important task of socialization had been carried out. Practically all socialist theorists take it for granted that immediately after the socialist revolution, during "the first phase of communism", to use an expression of Marx, there would be no equality of incomes. (#) It is only under "the higher phase of communism", after God knows how many generations or centuries, that the principle of "from

---

(#) There are a number of passages in Marx's <u>Critique of the Gotha Program</u> dealing with the distribution during "the first phase of communism". These passages have been generally interpreted by all writers to the effect that during the period in question there would be inequality of compensation. Among these writers are included such independent and dissimilar thinkers as Georges Sorel, in his "Decomposition du Marxisme" and Sidney Hook in his "Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx", neither of whom could be accused of being an apologist of the Stalin system whose official Marx-scholars use the same passages for justifying the inequalities of the Russian regime.

each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" would be applied. (It is hard to assume that a genius of the sharp intelligence of a Marx should not have seen thru the haziness, not to say deceitfulness, of this formula. For who is to determine a man's "needs"? None other apparently than the bureaucrats, the same men who in present-day Russia determine that a high class manager "needs" or, let us say, "deserves", several thousand rubles a month, while for an ordinary laborer or other plain worker, one hundred or one hundred fifty a month is sufficient.)

P.M. uses the old liturgical phrase of the "contradiction between the productive forces and the production relations" for his wishful contention that "capitalism...in all its manifestations must go under." Well, if he means that the private capitalist system is doomed, I have no quarrel with his statement; but the "state capitalism" Russian model which he includes among these manifestations, is no "capitalism" such as envisaged by Marxist criticism. It is a system of planned economy to which the Marxist concepts are not applicable; and its disappearance, or more correctly, its evolution towards a more equalitarian (and libertarian) form of socialism will be subject to altogether different laws, as to which there are no indications in the writings of the Teacher.

Another example of P.M.'s "wishful thinking" is his contention that a system, such as exists in Russia, would be impossible "in industrial countries". Aside from the fact that present day Russia is already a highly industrialized country, it would lead too far afield to follow his entire agrumentation. Suffice it to quote his conclusion which establishes the fallacy of his reasoning. He says that "in highly developed capitalist countries...any revolution is of necessity a workers' revolution (because) ...state capitalism.. likewise is incapable of improving their situation" (my emphasis - M.N.)

The very opposite is true. Even that one per cent of planned economy, or state capitalism, or paternalism, if you wish, which was instituted by the New Dealers, has undoubtedly improved the situation of large sections of the working class and won the sympathies of the masses for President Roosevelt. Only sectarianism can assert that if some unforeseen event should give the power to a combination of, let us say, left-wing New Dealers, Socialists and pink Communists, they would not open the closed plants and so increase the country's productivity as to have enough for raising substantially the general standard of living of the

masses. No doubt they would maintain a sharp division between the wages paid to the worker and the salaries of the managers and directors; but the sudden improvement of the lower levels would certainly add to the stability of the new "state capitalist" system.

That system will not last forever, of course. It will certainly be modified by further struggles of the workers intent upon obtaining a larger share in the distribution of the national income. But to say that the establishment of such a system is altogether "impossible" in the western countries, or that it could be only a passing adventure, is about as wise as the predictions about the impending fall of the Soviet regime which he have heard for the last eighteen years.

III - "COUNCILS" AND SOVIETS

There is a certain very definite purpose behind all this frantic and contradictory pleading. It is not merely the desire to defend the purity and the correctness of the Marxian scheme of things with its two-dimensional pattern of "capitalist" and "proletarian", that knew of no intellectuals as the possible inheritors of capitalist exploitation, and whose nondescript "petty-bourgeoisie" was bound to become a part of the "proletariat."

P.M. is the representative of a new revolutionary current that is out to regenerate Marxism after its defilement at the hands of the Socialists and the Communists. That new current - its followers call themselves "Council Communists" - also hopes to win over the masses still under the sway of the Teacher's unworthy disciples. It sees in the Workers' Councils the instrument for destroying the capitalist system and for establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now, the Council Communists realize that a criticism of the intelligentsia as the ruling class of the coming period of a socialized form of economy, is directed not only against the Socialists and the Communists, but against their own ambitions for power as well.

They will, of course, violently contest this considering that they do not constitute a party;that they include practically no intellectuals, and that their conception of the proletarian revolution is not that of the Bolshevik party dictatorship but the truly Marxist idea of a real dictatorship of the working masses.

Well, we have heard these things before. The modern French post-War syndicalists - those who remained revolutionists and have joined neither the S.P. nor the C.P. - have now adopted the slogan of "All power to the Trade Unions", as opposed to Communist party dictatorship. Those who can add two and two together have repeatedly pointed out to them that at bottom this was only another form of bolshevism;for, considering the intellectual level of the great majority of the working masses, "All power to the Trade Unions" could mean only "All Power to the Trade Union Bureaucrats"; in other words, the dictatorship of the educated upstart ex-workers at the head of the trade unions, such as the Hendersons, the Jouhaux, the Wm. Greens, the Legiens or Tomskys, all of whom in time became first class politicians and even cabinet members, differing in nothing from the "regular" intellectuals. A social system whose economic and political center were to be the French General Federation of Labor, would be in everything, except the terminology, identical with that established by the declasse intellectuals and ex-workers of the Russian Communist Party. The same criticism has likewise been applied to the Spanish anarchists of the present day, who are gradually, tho still shamefacedly, coming around to the idea of a revolutionary government by their own organization.

And how about the "Councils"? In the April, 1936 issue of the Council Correspondence there was an article about the Workers' Councils which certainly is revealing. "In the process of revolution" - the author says on page 27 - the old State power will be destroyed, and the organs that take its place, the workers' councils, for the time being, will certainly have important political functions still to repress the remnants of capitalist power. Their political function of governing, however, will be gradually turned into nothing but the economic function of managing the collective process of production of goods for the needs of society".

Were the Russian Soviets - and "Soviet" means nothing else but "Council" - not holding out the same promise of "withering away" of the State? Who, pray, will carry out these "important political functions to repress the remnants of capitalist power"? The masses? Or will it not be rather a special, well-armed body of truly proletarian Cheka-men, under the guidance of well-educated ex-workers, the most ardent militants of the "Council"idea? Where is the guarantee that these men, once entrusted with "important political functions to repress the remnants of capitalist power" will not repress the workers as well, by deceiving and

disarming them gradually, the way it was done by the just as ardent and honest Bolshevik Soviet militants? And will the sum total of all these ardent and honest council militants not constitute a party,whether they adopt that name or not? And will that party not be interested in establishing a privileged bureaucracy living on the fat of the land just as was done by the Russian bureaucracy? Do the Council Communists mean to say that their pure Marxist principles will prevent them from doing so? Do they actually believe that any class or group that has become a privileged stratum - and a victorious group, by seizing the government machine, usually develops into a privileged class - will abide by its pre-victory "principles" which were opposed to exploitation?

P.M.'s reply is very simple. "The means of production" he says "in the hands of the producer - by which the technically necessary centralism is not precluded but rendered imperative - that is communism." No - that is not "communism"; that is just sheer phrasemongering. The "necessary centralism" actually does away with "the means of production in the hands of the producers", i.e., of the factory councils, if I correctly get P.M.'s meaning. That "necessary centralism" is nothing but our good old Bolshevik state bureaucracy which under P.M.'s "real" proletarian dictatorship will simply be disguised under another name.Moreover, are not the "factory councils" themselves - composed as they are of the most energetic and the most intelligent and educated individuals - merely the basic embryonal unit of the new "proletarian" aristocracy that invariably rises above the masses, a process that is as old and as melancholy as the history of all human mass struggles since the beginning of time?

In an effort to show how, according to the conception of the Council Communists, the whole social fabric is practically in the hands of the workers themselves,P. M. writes that the "enterprise is the starting point of their (the workers') insurrection, the basis of their dictatorship and efforts at social reorganization". And what about the millions of the unemployed--sometimes one-third of the population - who will have to be taken care of? Before they get "the means of production in their hands" and can "start" anything at their "enterprise, it is the State, that is the bureaucracy, that will have to tackle the problem of reorganizing the industries, of opening the idle factories and of distributing work to the unemployed.And will the State bureaucracy, once it had acquired such an enormous power, voluntarily give up the source of that power?

There is a very suspicious passage on page 33 of P.M. article.He says there quite correctly that "without economic equality there is no communist society".(I take it that under "economic equality" he means plainly equal pay for a day's (#) work whether it be dishwashing or teaching astronomy). Then he adds: "This equality must not only be actually possible; it must also be capable of driving forward the productive forces of society, and until that time communism is quite out of the question."

What does this mean? Does P.M. intend to say that if in a highly industrial country like Germany,England or the United States the workers were to rise at present, seize the industries and install "their own" dictatorship in the form of Workers' Councils, the question might arise that equality of incomes would not be quite practicable immediately? Not that I believe that such full equality could be established immediately "on the morrow after the revolution" as the usual phrase goes. But if that complete economic equality of incomes cannot be established immediately, what will be the difference, except in personnel, between the "real" dictatorship of the proletariat, as advocated by the Council Communists, and the system of exploitation now established by the Russian Communists?

There is another suspicious sentence on the very same page. P.M. says that "with the setting aside of the class relations (P.M. apparently means the abolition of classes,M.N.) there vanish also the sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions." If these words have any significance, then they can mean only one thing: that there will be different income levels, but that these differences will not be very "sharp". Now, who is to determine what is or what is not a "sharp distinction?" It will be apparently the Central Office of the Workers' Councils or whatever other name the Government will assume. And will that Government, that is, the politico-technical office-holders, not be interested in establishing the same distinctions that would be introduced by any other privileged body?

P.M. apparently felt that the educational rift - which is a class rift - separating intellectual and manual workers, would militate against the establishment of complete economic equality right after the inauguration of the "proletarian dictatorship".So he

---

(#) Taking it for granted that in harmful occupations such as working in mines,sewers,etc.,the day will be shorter than in other industries or professions.

disposes of this difficulty by simply declaring that there are no "sharp distinctions", in fact, that there are practically no distinctions at all. He actually has the temerity to say that "the mass of the workers have become skilled workers"! (#) And that "the demands placed on that element of the population performing intellectual functions are no higher than those placed on the mass of the workers." Assertions which are on par with the old demagogical flatteries of Kautsky, Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht about the intellectual superiority of the workers over the bourgeoisie. The material kernel behind these flatteries being merely the perfectly justified conviction of the socialist leaders that they were just as able to run the country as their political opponents from the capitalist camp. In the same way P.M. identifies an infinitesimal minority of labor aristocrats - the potential intellectuals and future bosses - with the "working class" at large. It is the old, old story of the leaders demanding power not for themselves but for the masses which are so educated, so skilled, so intelligent that they will be able to run the government and the industries all by themselves.

Having thus somewhat vaguely indicated that there may be some distinctions in income levels even after the establishment of the "proletarian dictatorship", P.M. feels impelled to allay somewhat the misgivings as to the truly equalitarian character of his revolution. "If communism", he says, "is bound up with the presence of equality, then it is also beyond doubt that this equality will be actualized, for the social forces of production are impelling to communism and this impulsion is the historically determining factor". In other words, don't worry; some day the "social forces of production" will convince the Council Communists - or should I say Workers' Councils? - in charge of the new system, that the time has come to establish real equality of incomes. The "social forces of production" will work psychological miracles; the ex-workers in charge of the economic and political administration will forget their "present human egoism"; their egoism will apparently "find satisfaction in work in common" (p.32), and the bureaucratic wolf will voluntarily accept the same share of the national wealth as the proletarian sheep. We have read such stories once in the millenial visions

---

(#) It would be a waste of time to engage in the refutation of such an assertion, for the operations of the great majority of modern industrial workers can be learned in a few days or weeks; and if this is "skilled work", then a peanut peddler is a businessman and an ambulant scissors-grinder a manufacturer.

of the Hebrew prophets, and also in some of the utopian dreams of Charles Fourier. But this time they are being served with a sauce of "scientific socialism"....

Do I have to discuss the statement (p.34) that "there remains for the workers nothing but to take charge themselves of the social organization"? Where are the workers who are able to "take charge of the social organization"? Even if all workers were "class-conscious" they could not tackle the job because ninety-nine out of a hundred understand absolutely nothing of the complicated business of running a highly involved social system of the machine age.

No, it is obviously not the "workers" whom P.M. means by this sentence; it is, I repeat, that infinitesimal minority of workers, such as P.M. and his friends, who have acquired a certain amount of education and who have become intellectuals in fact - even if they are still compelled to work at the bench. As soon as the rising of the workers shakes the foundations of capitalism, these "workers" will naturally leave their benches and do what every organized revolutionary leadership is bound to do: establish their own dictatorship as was done by the Bolsheviks, and like them, enjoy the advantages of their victory.

Do I have to insist upon the obvious Marxian truth that the thoughts and the intentions of this new revolutionary leadership will not be determined by logical or theoretical considerations, but by the role they will play in the "social productien process" - after they will have arrived at the top of the social system and become a new privileged group jointly with the other intellectual workers who will be under their orders?

P.M. is altogether amazing when he says that "the necessarily spontaneous character of the insurrections....restricts the participation in them of the intellectuals not yet proletarianized." Not yet proletarianized! As if the trouble were merely with the bourgeois intellectuals, and not with the tragical antagonism between the interests of the underdog and its leadership as such. In fact, it is not the bourgeois intellectuals, but those who are "proletarianized", the declasses, the down-and-outers, those who are often poorer than the workers themselves, who as a rule become the leaders of the workers, and who, so far, have always betrayed them. (It is understood that this refers to the groups as such without any reflections upon the personal sincerity of particular individuals.)

Having thus left the door open for the "proletarianized" intellectuals, P.M. says on page 35 that "the present-day working class is quite in a position, without and if necessary, against the intellectuals, to make their revolution and to build up the new society." In other words, he wants a revolutionary movement headed by self-taught workers or ex-workers like himself, with the "proletarian" intellectuals playing a subordinate role. All the previous experience with the self-taught workers who make up the trade union bureaucracy of the whole world, and constitute a substantial part - if not the majority - of Russia's new bourgeoisie or nobility, has left him unimpressed.

With a simplicity that is touching he declares that "the whole problem of the intellectuals is one of subordinate importance." And that "any difficulties which may be occasioned by the intellectuals (after the revolution) may be dealt with in the framework of the proletarian dictatorship." In other words, if the Marxist college-boys of the C.P. will interfere with the Marxist ex-workers of the C.C., our real proletarian G.P.U. will show them what's what.

IV. THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

My critic repeatedly mentioned the name of my friend and teacher Waclaw Machajski, thus making it appear as though my opinions were in every respect identical with those of the author of the Intellectual Worker. Now, as P.M.'s presentation of some of our views was not quite beyond reproach, I am quoting a few passages from my book Rebels and Renegades which in condensed form give the gist of Machajski's opinions:

"In Machajski's conception, the socialist theories of the nineteenth century expressed the interests of the intellectual workers - not those of the working class, in which he placed the manual workers only. The mental workers, he argued, were a rising privileged class, fighting for a place in the sun against the old privileged classes, the landed owners and capitalists. Higher education was their specific "capital" - the source of their actual or potential higher incomes. Political democracy (or a revolutionary dictatorship, according to circumstances) was the first, and State Capitalism (used here for the reasons explained in the third footnote of Chapter II of this article) the next, step to their domination. To achieve these objects they needed the support of the manual workers. The confidence of the latter they won by helping them

in their early struggles for better wages and by dangling before them the socialist ideal of equality. That socialist Beyond was meant only as propaganda, as a sort of proletarian religion - not as an object of struggle for the living generation. The socialism which the radical intelligentsia really aspired to was nothing but State Capitalism (#); a system of government ownership, under which private capitalists would have yielded place to office-holders, managers, engineers; the coming form of exploitation in which the intellectual workers receiving higher salaries than those paid for manual labor, would constitute the new and only ruling class, absorbing into their ranks the former capitalists and the self-taught ex-workers.

"As a champion of the manual workers, particularly the unskilled and the unemployed, he advocated revolutionary mass struggle for higher wages and government provision for the unemployed, as the only issues of actual interest to the working class. The leadership of that struggle he visualized in the hands of an international secret organization of revolutionists. Engaged exclusively in unifying, and in extending the scope of, the spontaneous uprisings of the manual workers and of the unemployed, this organization "would dictate the law to the governments", using the weapon of "world-wide strikes". In other words, it would force the privileged classes and their governments to provide either work or support for the unemployed and to grant sweeping increases in the wages of the manual workers. Elimination of private capitalist profits, automatic transition to State Capitalism, and finally equalization of the incomes of the manual workers with those of the new rulers would be the progressive steps of the revolutionary mass struggle. Equality of income would secure to all an equal opportunity for higher education and thus would do away with all class divisions. The function of government having ceased to be the privilege of an educated minority, the State as an instrument of oppression amd exploitation would disappear. Marx considered that exploitation ceased with the disappearance of the private capitalists. In Machajski's opinion the Marxian scheme of eliminating capitalists but maintaining higher rewards for mental than for manual labor would 'substitute for the capitalists a class of hereditary soft-handed intellectuals who would perpetuate the slavery of the manual workers and of their offspring'".

(#) The words State Capitalism were used here for the reasons explained in the third footnote of Chapter II of this article.

Now, much as I agree with many of Machajski's ideas I think he is not consistent when he holds that his international secret organization of professional revolutionists, acting, so to speak, as the energizers of the spontaneous mass revolts,would actually usher in that classless millenium in which all exploitation would be eliminated once for all.Supposing that a revolutionary situation were actually to place his organization in the forefront of the class struggle, enabling it to bring any existing government to its knees and to force it into making sweeping economic concessions to the masses - what would then prevent that organization from seizing power? What would prevent it from consolidating its rule in the same manner as was done by the Bolsheviks, and from perpetuating the same economic inequalities which are now so apparent in Soviet Russia? Its original equalitarian principles? But principles are like promises. They hold good before the seizure of power, and are always disregarded after they have served their purpose.

In other words, the objection which I am rising against Machajski's conception of the "final" revolution is the same that holds with regard to any other revolutionary school, whether its followers call themselves Bolsheviks, anarchists, syndicalists or Council Communists. If they really adopt revolutionary measures for the overthrow of the existing system they can do nothing else but what was done by the Bolsheviks: seize power, organize a revolutionary government even though tney may give it another name, defend it against the reactionaries at first,and then consolidate it against the masses as well in the interest of a better paid new aristocracy of office-holders, technicians, and other members of the educated layers of society.

P.M. concludes that my position practically amounts to the old, old popular dictum "Thus it had been, thus it is, and thus it will remain"; in other words, that - as the saying has it - I consign the poor to statistics and to eternal slavery. My critic's indignation at my "skepticism" would be more convincing if in his mind the idea of working class emancipation were not identical with his own group's accession to power.

As a matter of fact, my "skepticism" is the very opposite of submission to fate. On the contrary,it implies permanent revolt against any status quo:capitalist exploitation of today, as well as socialist inequality of tomorrow. It is directed both against the property-owning oppressors of today and the job-holding

"liberators" of tomorrow; against the middle class of yesterday which used the workers in its struggle against feudal tyranny; and against the new middle class of today which uses them against the capitalist bourgeoisie; against the college-trained apologists of the coming form of slavery, and against their competitors from the ranks of the self-educated ex-workers.

The basic tenets of my "skepticism" could be summarized as follows:

1. The composition of the labor movements involves an inevitable partnership of mass and leadership;a partnership which, though to a certain extent beneficial to the masses, invariably results in a tragic conflict between the interests of the elite and those of the following.

2. These leading elites, being more educated than the masses, are essentially aristocratic in character, no matter whether they profess to be democratic,anarchist, socialist-communist, syndicalist or fascist.

3. Like all aristocratic groups, these elites are inevitably Machiavellian or amoral in their policies; keeping up their own "morale" with all sorts of philosophical justifications (rationalizations) and resorting constantly to a conscious or unconscious deception of the masses. All their considerations recede behind the one central purpose of obtaining and maintaining all power and its resulting benefits for their specific revolutionary or counter-revolutionary group.

4. Sooner or later all of these movements evolve certain religious features, the analogy with the material growth and spiritual decay of many of the great religions being particularly striking.

5. Just as in its struggles of a century ago, the bourgeoisie aroused the masses against the remnants of feudalism and in the process unwittingly contributed to an improvement of the position of the workers of the industrial era, the malcontent intellectuals, by organizing the workers against the capitalists are likewise indirectly contributing to a further elevation of the social status of the downtrodden.

6. There is an ever recurring competition for power between the various groups of the educated malcontents in charge of these mass movements. That competition for power, with the help, and at the expense of the uneducated masses engaged in physical work, is at the same time a guaranty against stagnation and the per-

petuation of the status quo.

7. After the elimination of the capitalist owners, there follows inevitably a period of internecine contests between various groups of intellectuals and educated ex-workers for predominance within the government machine - the Trotsky-Stalin complex - caused by the oligarchical tendencies prevailing within each ruling class. The urge to win forces the rebellious rivals to appeal to the dissatisfaction of the manual workers and to assist them in obtaining a larger share of the national income. This process is accompanied by the rise of the most educated and the most intelligent elements among the manual workers themselves, joining either of the contending groups or making their own bid for power.

8. These three- or four-cornered struggles for power, joined in occasionally by disinterested idealists championing the cause of the underdog, constitute the elements of the permanent revolution which will unceasingly work for the continuous rise in the material and educational standard of the working masses - even though aristocratic tendencies making for oligarchical rule and the more privileged status of thos wielding the most efficient combination of knowledge, intelligence and ruthlessness, may persist in one form or another.

9. For those who are not out for power or personal advantage, and whose sentiments are with the horny-handed underdog, there is only one thing to do: To give up the idea that there could be any specific organization of "really proletarian" rebels, which is more "honest" or more "consistent" than all the other parties or groups. For every organization wants only one thing: power; that is privilege, for itself and for its more active members. Those who are eager for a good fight may further the cause of the workers by joining any revolutionary or trade union organization which in one way or another is opposed to the existing system. Each of these organizations, in its endeavor to win the workers, is bound to help them in obtaining higher wages, shorter hours and jobs or relief for the unemployed. Within any of these organizations a disinterested working class rebel can do his useful work by pushing forward any working class struggle for better conditions; and by denouncing the leaders if for one reason or another they may be suspected of restraining the masses or of selling them out. Any large-scale wage struggle, any large-scale campaign of the unemployed for jobs, is fraught with the potentialities of a general uprising of the masses, of the expropriation of the capitalists, and of the establishment of a planned socialist econo-

my, with its further struggles <u>for more and always more</u>, continuously reducing the disparities between the material and educational level of the bureaucratic masters and that of the slaves of physical labor.

This is my conception of the <u>Permanent Revolution</u>. It <u>is</u> permanent, and it knows of no millenium in which full harmony has been achieved once for all eternity.

The <u>final</u> revolution may be left to those who dream merely of their own elevation over the masses.

- Max Nomad -

A New C.C. Pamphlet:

<u>What C O M M U N I S M Really Is</u>

The Social Average Labor Time as the Basis

of Communist Production and

Distribution

Order At Once: Council Correspondence
1237 N.California Ave, Chicago, Ill.
Price : 10 cents

:::::::::::::::::::::::::: ::::::::

The next issue of the Council Correspondence will bring:

<u>THE CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN</u>

<u>GERMAN IMPERIALISM</u> ,

and other important articles.

::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::

Soon to be published:

OUTLINE of MARX'S C<u>APITAL</u>

THE PARTY AND THE WORKING CLASS.

The first traces of a new labor movement are just becoming visible. The old movement is organized in parties. The belief in parties is the main reason for the impotence of the working class; therefore we avoid forming a new party - not because we are too few, but because a party is an organization that aims to lead and control the working class.

In opposition to this, we maintain the working class can rise to victory only when it independently attacks its problems and decides its own fate. The workers should not unquestioningly accept the slogans of others, nor of our own groups, but must think,act and decide for themselves. This conception is in sharp contradiction to the tradition of the party as the most important means of educating the proletariat. Therefore many , though repudiating the Socialist and Communist parties, resist and oppose us. This is partly due to their traditional concepts; after viewing the class struggle as a struggle of parties, it becomes difficult to consider it as purely the struggle of the working class, as a class struggle.But partly this concept is based on the idea that the party nevertheless plays an essential and important part in the struggle of the proletariat. Let us investigate this latter idea more closely.

Essentially, the party is a grouping according to views, conceptions; the classes are groupings according to economic interests. Class membership is determined by one's part in the process of production; party membership is the joining of persons who agree in their conceptions of the social problems.Formerly it was thought this contradiction would disappear in the class party, the"workers' party". During the rise of the Social-Democracy, it seemed that it would gradually embrace the whole working class, partly as members, partly as supporters. Because Marxian theory declared that similar interests beget similar viewpoints and aims, the contradiction between party and class was expected gradually to disappear. History proved otherwise. The Social-Democracy remained a minority, other working class groups organized against it, sections split away from it, and its own character changed. Its own program was revised or reinterpreted.

The evolution of society does not proceed along a smooth even line, but in conflicts and contradictions.

With the intensification of the workers' struggle, the might of the enemy also increases and besets the workers with renewed doubts and fears as to which road is the best. And every doubt brings on splits, contradictions, and fractional battles within the labor movement. It is futile to bewail these conflicts and splits as harmful in dividing and weakening the working class. The working class is not weak because it is split up - it is split up because it is weak. Because the enemy is powerful and the old methods of warfare prove unavailing, the working class must seek new methods. Its task will not become clear as the result of enlightenment from above, it must discover it thru hard work, thru thought and conflict of opinions. It must find its own way; therefore the internal struggles. It must relinquish old ideas and illusions and adopt new ones, and because this is difficult, therefore the magnitude and severity of the splits.

Nor can we delude ourselves into believing that this period of party and ideological strife is only temporary and will make way to renewed harmony. True, in the course of the class struggle there are occasions when all forces unite on a great achievable objective and the revolution is carried on with the might of a united working class. But after that, as after every victory, come the differences on the question: what next? And even if the working class is victorious, it is always confronted by the most difficult task of subduing the enemy further, reorganizing production, creating new order. It is impossible that all workers, all strata and groups, with their oft-times still diverse interests should, at this stage, agree on all matters and be ready for united rapid and decisive further action. They will find the true course only after the sharpest controversies and conflicts and only thus will achieve clarity.

If, .n this situation, persons with the same fundamental conceptions unite for the discussion of practical steps and seek clarification thru discussions, and propagandize their conclusions, such groups might be called parties, but they would be parties in an entirely different sense from those of today. Action, the actual struggle, is the task of the working masses themselves, in their entirety, in their natural groupings as factory and millhands, or other natural productive groups, because history and economy have placed them in the position where they must and they only can fight the working class struggle. It would be insane if the supporters of one party were to go on strike while those of another continue to work. But both tendencies will defend their position on strike or no strike in the factory meetings, thus af-

fording an opportunity to arrive at a well-founded decision. The struggle is so great, the enemy so powerful that only the masses as a whole can achieve a victory - the result of the material and moral power of action, unity and enthusiasm, but also the result of the mental force of thought, of clarity. In this lies the great inportance of such parties or groups based on opinions, that they bring clarity in their conflicts, discussions and propaganda. They are the organs of the self-enlightenment of the working class by means of which the workers find their way to freedom.

Naturally <u>such</u> parties are not static and unchangeable. Every new situation, every new problem will find minds diverging and uniting in new groups with new programs. They have a fluctuating character and constantly readjust themselves to new situations.

Compared to such groups, the present workers' parties have an entirely different character, for they have a different objective; they want to seize power for themselves. They aim not at being an aid to the working class in its struggle for emancipation, but to rule it themselves and proclaim that constitutes the emancipation of the proletariat. The Social Democracy which rose in the era of parliamentarism conceives of this rule as a parliamentary government. The Communist Party carries the idea of party rule thru to its furthest extreme in the party dictatorship.

Such parties, in distinction to the groups described above, must be rigid structures with clear lines of demarcation thru membership card, statutes, party discipline and admission and expulsion procedures. For they are instruments of power, fight for power, bridle their members by force and constantly seek to extend the scope of their power. It is not their task to develop the initiative of the workers; rather do they aim at training loyal and unquestioning members of their faith. While the working class in its struggle for power and victory needs unlimited intellectual freedom, the party rule must suppress all opinions except its own. In "democratic" parties, the suppression is veiled; in the dictatorship parties, it is open, brutal suppression.

Many workers already realize that the rule of the Socialist or Communist party will be but the concealed form of the rule of a bourgeois class in which the exploitation and suppression of the working class remains. Instead of these parties, they urge the formation of a "revolutionary party" that will really aim at the rule of the workers and the realization of

communism. Not a party in the new sense of those described above, but a party as those of today, that fights for power as the vanguard of the class,as the organization of conscious, revolutionary minority that seizes power in order to use it for the emancipation of the class.

We claim there is an internal contradiction in the term: "revolutionary party". Such a party cannot be revolutionary. It is no more revolutionary than the creators of the third Reich. When we speak of revolution,we naturally speak of the proletarian revolution, the seizure of power by the working class itself.

The "revolutionary party" is based on the idea that the working class needs a group of leaders who vanquish the bourgeoisie for the workers and to construct a new government - (note that the working class is not yet considered fit to reorganize and regulate production). But is not this as it should be? As the working class does not yet seem capable of revolution, is it not necessary that the revolutionary vanguard, the party, make the revolution for it? And is this not true as long as the masses willingly endure capitalism?

Against this, we raise the question: what forces can such a party raise for the revolution? How is it able to defeat the capitalist class? Only if the masses stand behind it. Only if the masses rise and thru mass attacks, mass struggle, and mass strikes, overthrow the old regime. Without the action of the masses, there can be no revolution.

Two things can follow. The masses remain in action, they do not go home and leave the government to the new party. They organize their power in factory and workshop, prepare for the further conflict to the complete defeat of capital; thru the workers' councils they establish a firm union to take over the complete direction of all society - in other words, they prove they are not as incapable of revolution as it seemed. Of necessity, then, conflicts will arise with the party which itself wants to take over power and which sees only disorder and anarchy in the self-action of the working class.Possibly the workers will develop their movement and sweep out the party. Or, the party, with the help of bourgeois elements defeats the workers. In either case, the party is an obstacle to the revolution, because it wants to be more than a means of propaganda and enlightenment; because it feels itself called upon to lead and rule as a party.

On the other hand the masses may follow the party faith,and leave to it the further direction of affairs. They follow the slogans from above, have confidence in the new government (as in Germany in 1918) that is to realize communism and go back home and to work.Immediately the bourgeoisie exerts its whole class power the roots of which are unbroken;its financial forces,its great intellectuals resources, and its economic power in factories and great enterprises. Against this the government party is too weak.Only through moderation, concessions and yielding can it maintain itself.The excuse is given then, that more can not be secured at the moment, that it is insanity for the workers to try to force impossible demands. Thus the party,deprived of class power becomes the instrument for maintaining bourgeois power.

We stated before that the term "revolutionary party" was contradictory in the proletarian sense.We can state it otherwise:In the term"revolutionary Party" "revolutionary" always means a bourgeois revolution. Always, when the masses overthrow a government and then allow a new party to take power we have a bourgeois revolution-the substitution of a ruling caste by a new ruling caste. It was so in Paris in 1830 when the finance bourgeoisie supplanted the landed proprietors, in 1848 when the industrial bourgeoisie supplanted the financiers, and in 1870 the combined petty and large bourgeoisie took over the reins.

In the Russian revolution the party bureaucracy came to power as the ruling caste.But in Western Europe and America the bourgeoisie is much more powerfully entrenched in plants and banks, so that a party bureaucracy cannot push them aside.The bourgeoisie in these countries can be vanquished only by repeated and united action of the masses in which they seize the mills and factories and build up their councils.

Those who speak of "revolutionary parties" draw incomplete,limited conclusions from history.When the Socialist and Communist parties became organs of bourgeois rule for the perpetuation of exploitation,these well meaning people merely concluded that they would have to do better.They cannot realize that the failure of these parties is due to the fundamental conflict between the self emancipation of the working class through its own power and the pacifying of the revolution through a new sympathetic ruling clique.They think they are the revolutionary vanguard because they see the masses indifferent and inactive.But the masses are inactive only because they cannot yet comprehend the course of the struggle and the unity of class interests, although they instinctively sense the great power of the enemy and the enormity of their task.Once condition force them into action they will attack the task of self organization and the conquest of the economic power of capital.

##########

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

The Civil War in SPAIN!

- ***Permanent Causes of Social Unrest***
- ***The Labor Movement***
- ***International Complications***
- ***The Events of 1936***

Vol. II **No. 11**

OCTOBER 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

.·. Published at 1237 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois .·.
By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

THE CIVIL WAR IN SPAIN

I

To obtain an adequate idea of the present situation in Spain, one must take into account the previous development. Regarded from the capitalist standpoint, Spain has remained a backward country. The semi-feudal conditions still prevailing are due to a number of factors, among which might be mentioned: the geographical position which almost makes the peninsula rather a part of Africa than of Europe; the hot climate which hinders the development of agricultural productivity; and the mountainous character of the country which stands in the way of communication and has maintained provincialism. The final causes of the spanish backwardness, however, are to be found less in these natural impediments than in others of a social and political nature.

It would be necessary to go far back into the history of Spain in order to point out how the feudal property relations were capable of impeding her capitalist development. In spite of the wars by which the country was ravaged thru-out the centuries, the christian rulers, after the expulsion of the Moors, came into a rich inheritance. In the Middle Ages, christian-feudal

Spain ranked as the wealthiest and most powerful country of Europe. This wealth was still further increased thru the colonial expeditions to Central and South America enabling the formation of a great parasitical ruler class whose luxurious living was not bound up with the development of the productive forces in Spain, but whose interests were rather best secured thru the suppression of new upward-struggling classes which are formed thru the increasing social forces of production. The holding down of all progressive forces in Spain by way of the feudal nobility and the Church constitutes one of the bloodiest chapters of human history.

The elements interested in a bourgeois revolution were unable to oppose successfully the vast power of feudalism, even when, with the development of capitalism in the rest of Europe, spanish pre-eminence was superseded and the economic and political decline set in. Central and South America freed themselves from spanish rule; finally the United States appropriated Cuba and the Philippines; and Spain was now left with only her home territory and sank to a second-rate power.

But the development of the productive forces can at most be restricted, not completely prevented. Feudalism itself must become "progressive" if it suppresses the progressive classes. The partial capitalization of Spain could be opposed only under pain of her disappearance as an independent nation; and so, in spite of the feudalistic political rule, Spain could not close herself off against the development of capitalism. But this capitalization, bearing the marks of feudal restrictions, brought with it a number of economic and political contradictions which signified for the great masses of the population an immoderate poverty, and which furthermore stood in the way of capitalist profitability and determined the revolutionary uprisings and class conflicts of the last hundred years. The weakness of spanish capital forced upon it a policy of compromise with the landed proprietors and the Church: a condition by which Spain has been characterized down to the present time and which, altho it secured the exploiting society against the exploited people, at the same time formed the basis of continual social friction which more and more irresistibly pressed for violent solutions.

For the last forty years the industrial bourgeoisie, with the development of its strength thus impeded, has been attempting in its own interest to drive back the feudal-conservative forces. Capital importation, by which more than ten percent of all spanish industry was brought into the hands of foreign capitalists,

supported on the one hand the capitalist struggle against feudalism, while on the other it was prejudicial to the interests of spanish capital. This union of foreign capital to the trinitarian exploiting group of domestic origin brought further complications into the already highly complicated class and group interests. The country's output, agricultural as well as industrial, continued far behind the demands of the exploiters. Tho it slowly increased, it did not suffice; and the struggle for the dividion of the surplus value was often conducted with great vigor,but had always ended, owing to the unbroken power of the spanish junkers, in new compromises marked by the tariff policy so that the spanish population became the most impoverished and thereby also the most unproductive of Western Europe. High custom duties on farm products assure their incomes to the landlords and dispense them from putting agriculture on a capitalist basis. The high prices of farm products make necessary, in turn, industrial tariffs in order just to maintain the profitability of capital.Both policies impede the development of the domestic market and,because of the slight productivity, preclude capacity to compete on the world market. In the long run,this state of affairs is untenable; still, the constellation of the class forces has hitherto not permitted anything other than this situation of general relative stagnation.

Spain has about 23 million inhabitants. The density of population is very slight. The contrast between poor and rich is incredibly great. Landed proprietors with enormous domains are offset by a mass of landpoor or quite propertyless peasants and farm workers. Tho more than half the population is engaged in farming, still the productivity is so slight that the importation of foodstuffs remains a necessity. Only 40 percent of the soil is cultivated, and even that is poorly utilized. The means of production are shockingly primitive, the wooden plow drawn by oxen being still the rule. The land owners lease the soil on terms which scarcely permit the tenants, notwithstanding the hardest labor, to eke out more than a bare existence. Under the prevailing conditions, the improvement of the productivity of the soil is neither desired nor possible. The shortness of the lease agreement and the hardness of the terms cannot produce in the tenants any initiative directed to increase of production. The proprietors themselves have no great interest in the promotion of productivity since it is only the scarcity of farm products by which their monopolistic position can be secured. They are most keenly interested in preventing the penetration of capitalist competition in agriculture, and foreign

competition is warded off by means of the protective tariff policy. The independent farmers suffer from lack of land and capital; they are not in a position to equip themselves with modern means of production nor to employ them. For the most part, they are wretched self-providers to whom the market is of no concern and whose situation is not much better than that of the two million agricultural wage workers. Only a radical agrarian revolution could solve the problems of the agricultural elements, just as it would also provide the necessary impetus for the further capitalist development. But that requires more courage and strength than is yet possessed by the spanish bourgeoisie.

To the 20 to 30 thousand landed proprietors belong two-thirds of all the soil. Some of them are at the same time industrial owners, just as many industrialists, inversely, are at the same time large land owners: a circumstance which partially wipes out the distinctions between the bourgeois and the feudal interests. The Catholic Church is not only the largest land owner of Spain, but also has influence in industry and upon the banks; and this likewise weakens the position of the authentic modern bourgeoisie. The struggle against the Church in Spain is for this reason essentially a struggle against an owning and directly exploiting institution, and must be conducted the more bitterly as the Church has hitherto possessed a monopoly in the nursing of ideologies. Deducting further from the spanish account the part represented by foreign ownership, no more is required to explain the relative weakness of the progressive bourgeoisie with respect to the forces interested in the maintenance of the present conditions.

The difficulties which the feudal forces have set in the path of capitalist development, together with the relative backwardness of capital and the slow development of the domestic market, are manifested also in a general overproduction. An actual lack of capital and an actual shortage of industrial workers assumes in these bizarre conditions, just as in countries with overaccumulation, the form of a superfluity of capital and a great lack of employment. The world crisis, and here especially with reference to agriculture, has added still other difficulties to those of a purely domestic origin, and for the last five years has brought with it a permanent condition of political crisis. The thing that the bourgeoisie would have to do--namely, set aside the semi-feudal conditions--it cannot yet, and at the same time, no longer accomplish. Since the land-owning class is in control of the State and has in its hands the instruments of power, the bourgeoisie

rinds itself in this respect also dependent on the spanish junkers. It is only thru the complete setting aside of the present military apparatus of suppression --and that is possible only by revolutionary means-- that the progressive bourgeoisie could impose its will upon the feudal nobility. Hitherto, the actions of the various governments have rather been determined by the army and the bureaucracy, the actual wielders of power, and the governments were hardly capable of viewing them as their own instrument. The large class of petty-bourgeoisie is in part bound up economically with the semi-feudal conditions; in smaller part it is progressively minded tho in the sense of safeguarding its bourgeois-capitalist interests against the feudal obstacles in their way. It is probably only under the pressure of the workers that the progressive wing of the petty bourgeoisie could be recondiled to more than mild reformist measures.

In addition to the feeble bourgeoisie, the vacillating and divided middle class, the land-hungry peasant mass and the farm workers, there is also directed against the present conditions the approximately two millions embraced in the industrial proletariat. The bourgeoisie does not dare, however, to make use of all these elements in a decisive thrust against feudalism. Like the impoverished farm workers, the industrial proletariat also is forced by its poverty to be revolutionary. In the matter of revolutionary initiative and insight into its real needs, the spanish proletariat is quite on a level with that of the other capitalist countries. It is true that, owing to spanish peculiarities, this working population has also its special characteristics and problems, but the general backwardness of the country has no more been able to prevent the development of a revolutionary proletariat than the establishment of modern industrial enterprises and capitalist methods of exploitation. The spanish industrial workers no longer see salvation in capitalism; the conscious part of them is looking for truly proletarian, communist solutions.

Thus the spanish bourgeoisie is faced with a dilemma: it fears the reaction as well as the revolution, and dreams of an improvement in the speed of its railway trains, which are the slowest in Europe. It is compelled to defend not only the interests of capitalism, but of property in general, and will oppose any movement which would be liable to forge beyond the ideals of the bourgeois-democratic exploitation society. The proletariat, which already has its own revolutionary goals, will perhaps, in case of a radical agrarian revolution occurring simultaneously, combine with the expropriation of the land-owners that of the capital-

ists. Hence also the fear of the agrarian revolution on the part of the bourgeoisie; its reforms in this particular were not so much intended to further that revolution as to hold it up. A workers' and peasants' revolution may lead to a state capitalism which will do away also with present-day private property. However necessary for the bourgeoisie the struggle against feudalism really is, the danger is equally great that such a struggle, if conducted seriously, would lead to a state capitalism of the russian type in which the old owners are displaced in the interest of a new, collective exploiting class in the guise of the State. In such circumstances, the sharing of the rulership with feudalism is for the bourgeoisie a lesser evil; but this "sharing" makes it necessary for the bourgeoisie to be drawn along in the wake of the large landed proprietorship which is its fortune and misfortune at the same time.

Even tho the parliamentary labor parties today renounce the struggle for state capitalism and content themselves with the government positions at the disposal of the bourgeoisie, the question already arises whether it will be possible for them to divert the workers' and peasants' revolution into a mere change of exploiters. Just as under the present conditions a movement aiming at the democratic republic is capable of ending up in the proletarian revolution, so it is also possible that the labor organizations which come out for the democratic republic or even for state capitalism will be overrun by the revolutionary masses. In such circumstances the bourgeoisie is not inclined to fight feudalism unless the latter leaves it no choice, and is accordingly ever ready to break off the conflict with the most favorable compromise. In such conditions, the proletariat cannot take up for the interests of the bourgeoisie, or subordinate itself to bourgeois leadership, except under certain pain of being struck down later on.

II

The spanish class conflicts led, in 1931, to the fall of the monarchy and to the establishment of a bourgeois-democratic regime. The "agrarian reform" bound up with this political change was inadequate, and incapable of meeting the needs of the country population. The indemnities to be paid to the land-owners for relinquished domains were set so high that the burden upon the peasants was not at all mitigated. In many localities the peasants took possession of the large estates; but even tho these expropriations were in part later legalized by the government, still at the same time the peasants were subjected to new burdens

which were no more bearable than the old lease obligations. The Zamora republic was not inclined to proceed against the interests of the land owners,as also in the political field it did not dare to suppress the reaction. The reactionary forces assembled again and organized further advances. The fascist "Accion Pupular" of Gil Robles unfolded a far-flung propaganda which, by way of skillful demagogy, was able to win influence even among the impoverished and deluded peasants. In view of the continuing social unrest, brought about thru the isolated but ever recurring manifestations of the workers and of a part of the farm population, the bourgeoisie once more formed a closer union with the reactionary forces. The elections of 1933 had again put the reactionaries in charge of the government, which now proceeded more harshly against the workers and the rebellious peasants. The restless humor of the country was reflected in the rapid alternation of the governments: from Azana to Lerroux and Martinez Barrio, and then to Lerroux and Gil Robles. The uprising in Asturias in October 1934 formed the climax of the proletarian endeavors to make use of the revolutionary currents for proletarian ends and to strike the decisive blow at the reaction. The uprising remained isolated and was suppressed, tho the attempt to establish social peace was still by no means successful. The acutely revolutionary situation led to a number of government crises in conformity with the reorientations of the different classes and groups, amd which pointed to new and greater conflicts to come. The elections at the beginning of this year witnessed a new coalition of the liberal bourgeoisie with the parliamentary labor parties and led to the forming of the "Popular Front Government."

This new government promised to put thru a series of reforms, such as are advocated by liberalism in general, and a better agrarian reform with partial land distribution. Azana declared on February 20th that "the government wants to govern in accordance with the laws, desires no dangerous innovations and comes out as a government of the moderates in favor of social peace and order". Even tho the parliamentary labor parties were in sympathy with this moderation, it was not very tasteful to the workers and peasants. These latter, taking their stand on the promise of the new government, wanted to put them into effect. The peasants arbitrarily expropriated some of the land; the strike struggles of the workers for higher wages and better working conditions no longer ceased; on the streets, workers and fascists engaged in bloody conflicts; the social peace and the capitalist order continued to be endangered.

The reaction was far from regarding itself as beaten by the electoral victory of the liberal forces. The less so as, notwithstanding the fact that the elections had given the popular-front parties most of the seats in Parliament, the majority of the votes had been cast for the rightist organizations. That is to say, that while the spanish electoral procedure had made it possible for the "leftists" to obtain 265 out of the 473 seats in Parliament, over against the 4,356,559 votes cast for them were the 5,051,955 of the rightists. The popular-front "government", which of course was made up only of bourgeois-liberalistic elements, was unable to govern, as would have been necessary, either against the workers or against the reaction; for the state machinery had remained in the hands of the rightists. The workers attempted to broaden the movement against the reaction into one against exploitation in general: a situation which left the government no choice but to look for new compromise solutions, which, however, were neither able to restrain the workers nor to prevent the fascist movement from assembling its forces for a new thrust. Down to the fascist uprising of the army in July 1936, there was one workers' strike after another. The government was not in a position, even with the aid of the labor parties, to put an end to this movement. At the same time it did not dare to purge the administrative system and the military apparatus of the reactionary elements, for in the first place it might have to bring this apparatus into action against the workers, and secondly, it was afraid of offering the reaction any provocation. The procrastination of the liberal bourgeoisie was at the same time the strengthening of the reactionary elements: fascism was making ready for the decisive blow. Shortly before the outbreak of the military uprising, La Battalla (Barcelona) wrote: "After three months of life, the present Cortes is done for. The Cortes continues to discuss juridical problems, pensions, trifles, while down below are hunger, want, anxiety, intense uneasiness and the fewer of revolution. Our government is sterile and artificial. Sterile because it is incapable of producing anything useful, because it performs fancy tricks on a loose rope in its desire to avoid revolution, tho it owes its existence precisely to a revolutionary movement. The State apparatus does what it pleases. Its decisions are not determined in any way whatsoever by the government. The State machinery is in permanent insurrection against the government. The Popular Front, finds itself facing a revolt of the laboring masses, who categorically refuse its order to mark time at the moment when it is plainly necessary to move fast. And enfolding all is the formidable economic crisis, which is getting worse every

day. The reactionary forces of the country have recovered their voices and are attacking energetically. They are attacking in the Parliament, on the streets, in the Councils of the Administration, in the pulpits, in the national and foreign press, in the very organization of the State."

Shortly thereafter occurred, in alliance with the fascist formations and the Church, the uprising of the army against the government. The government's fear of taking vigorous steps against the old governing apparatus, its efforts to hold back the workers, the restriction of its own actions to that of a moderate democratic-capitalist policy, and the support of this temporizing policy at the hands of the parliamentary labor parties,--all that had provided the reactionaries with time and opportunity to prepare the rebellion thoroly. The condition of permanent social tension and the lack of clarity with respect to the actual constellation of the class forces was to be ended by way of the fascist dictatorship. All of which is an indication that the time for a well-ordered,nicely democratic, liberal and progressive capitalism is past. The incapacity of spanish capitalism to set up its own dictatorship and impose its own will upon the other classes, and, notwithstanding the aid of the parliamentary labor parties, its inability to guarantee that the masses would continue to submit to being suppressed and exploited; the danger that the bourgeoisie, in its own interest and for the sake of maintaining the exploitation society generally, would sacrifice, half willingly or from force of circumstances,a part of the feudal interests: these considerations furnished occasion for the reaction, even before the population had been subjected to an adequate dose of demagogy, to attempt to establish by force its "law and order". Spanish capital was unable to being about this "order" quick enough for the reaction which took the temporizing as a sign of weakness. And if the government was not in a position to create order against the workers, it was also not in a position to proceed against the bringers of order on the side of the reaction. The fascist attack is as little directed against capitalism as capital was interested in the abolition of the land owners' privileges. The reaction simply realized that any concession which the bourgeois government made to the workers had to be made at the expense of the reactionary elements. What was given to the poor peasants and to the workers had to be taken away from the land owners and the Church, if capital itself was not to be prejudiced. The reaction, however is of the opinion that neither the peasants nor the workers need to be given anything but hunger and bullets, and so it set about to create the necessary

"order" for itself and for capitalism. It further acted by order of that part of capital which is more interested in the maintenance of the existing conditions than in a general progressive further development of capitalism. In Spain, also, a part of big capital is not disinclined to make common cause with the junkers against all other strata of the population and against smaller capitals. And if the feudal reaction makes "order" for the entire exploiting society, it can thereby also, within this order, retain the preeminence which it has hitherto enjoyed and which was already in danger of crumbling, or at least share the power with capital under much more favorable conditions for itself.

The liberalistic government was given no opportunity to capitulate. The fascist attack, by reason of its extent and fierceness, precluded any seeking after compromise solutions. It was not directed against Capital, but only against a governmental tendency and against a government which by its previous policy seemed liable to become the prisoner of the labor movement and which was left with no choice but to defend itself against the fascist opposition. The fascists, considering the weakness of the government, counted upon a quick victory; they under-estimated the power of resistence of the workers, who joined together for a decisive counter-attack.

The army, to which the fascist organizations were linked, rebelled in almost all parts of the peninsula, but with few exceptions was quickly suppressed in those areas having a strong labor movement. From Morocco, the spanish Foreign Legion and the Moors were set in motion. In those areas which were not forthwith taken over by the fascists, the Shock Police and the Civil Guard remained in large part loyal to the government of Madrid. The legal government retained the loyalty also of the larger part of the fleet and of the air forces. The government was compelled to form a workers' militia. In this connection it hesitated, and still for a long while sought to prevent the preeminence of the militia over the regular soldiery; but the initiative of the workers placed it before the accomplished fact that the militia had become the principal military formation. During the first few weeks of the struggle, the government, speculating upon further compromises, sought to restrict the workers as far as possible to bourgeois-military measures, and in those localities which were temporarily secured against fascism, it tried to continue the bourgeois order unchanged. This attitude, which was designed to prevent the defensive struggle from turning into a radical workers' revolution, greatly impeded the anti-

fascist counter-attack and promoted the military successes of the officer caste. It was not until all hopes of compromise were recognized as an illusion, and the workers began to relax their union with the government as well as to get out more and more from under the control of the parliamentary labor parties, --it was only then that the defense was pushed with greater vigor from the side of the government also.

As moderate as was the popular-front government prior to the uprising, with equal moderation it wanted the uprising suppressed. And the labor parties belonging to the Popular-Front declared themselves in sympathy with this moderation. The fighting workers, however, who felt all too keenly on their own bodies, the lack of moderation among the fascists, could not acquire much taste for this harmonistic "anti-fascism". They were obliged, under pain of being struck dead, themselves to become immoderate. It is one thing to be shot, and another to issue directives from a distance. A news reporter of the Communist Party, engaged in glorifying Azana, wrote in the Rundschau of August 13th: "Azana takes us to the window of his private office. It is in the former royal palace. The chain of the Sierra Guadarrama stands forth blue in the distance. 'There is the front', he says and adds, laughing, 'and one can often see from here the smoke of the cannon'."

Even tho the popular-front parties were agreed that the policies should continue to be shaped by people who only see the smoke of the cannon in the distance, and for whom the workers are now to die just as previously they had worked for them, still the self-initiative of the workers soon created a quite different situation and made of the political defensive struggle against fascism the beginning of a real social revolution.

Like the Social Democracy thruout the world, so also that of Spain is not interested in socialism. It is true that fascism means its death, but then, too, it would be strangled by communism. And so the social democrats are obliged either to restrict themselves to performing valet services for the democratic bourgeoisie, so long as this latter can afford democracy, or else to become bolshevists and take up for a kind of state capitalism. Otherwise there only remains for them to go the way of Severing and Doriot. Still, in the present conditions, the spanish Social Democracy, even with the support of the spanish Stalinists, is lacking in strength and will to release and put over a movement having its goal in state capitalism. The reasons for this are of an international as well as national nature. It is questionable, for instance,

whether the international bourgeoisie would not,thru intervention, help to put a speedy end to a spanish state capitalism, since the thoro state capitalism is bound up with complete expropriation of the present capitalists and so, even tho not for the workers, yet for the present bourgeoisie, is the same as communism. As things now stand in Spain, there is a possibility that, thru the self-initiative of the workers in the course of a revolution aiming at state capitalism,the expropriation of private capital will be thoroly accomplished. A state capitalism in the italian sense (which doesn't really deserve the name), by which the interests of private property are not abolished but coordinated and which would be at the service of the economically strongest elements of Spain,is certainly aimed at by the fascists themselves; and here the Social Democracy, even with the best will in the world, would surely be left out of the competition. In view of the inner spanish situation, a state capitalism controlled by the Socialist-Stalinists is unlikely also so for the simple reason that the anarcho-syndicalist labor movement would itself probably seize the power rather than bow to the social-democratic dictatorship. And so the Social Democracy remains true to its traditions and continues to restrict itself to forming the left wing of the bourgeoisie. Every step to the left which the socialists made later on was forced by the manifestations of the armed workers; the "partial socialization" which the socialists began, or which rather they did not dare to prevent, were temporary concessions to the workers in order to avoid the crumbling of the front against fascism;for the striking down of fascism is also a condition precedent to the bare existence of the social democrats. And since a victorious fascism would cut <u>their</u> throats as well, they will also, in case the workers should succeed in expropriating the whole of capital, be reconciled to a form of state capitalism, and later place themselves at the head of such a movement in order to make it as mild as possible. So long, however, as the workers refrain from taking up the expropriation of capital on their own initiative, the Social Democracy will stick to the maintenance of capitalist democracy,or perhaps even, in the interest of this democracy, undertake a pseudo-socialization, as was done by the german social democrats after the collapse of the empire and after the Kapp Putsch. If the fascists should fail to win the power, and if for any reason the capitalist intervention should not materialize, there is also the possibility that the Social Democracy, in the name of the spanish and of world capitalism and by means of the government power, if such should come into its hands, will itself create that "order" which today is the concern of the fascists.

The spanish Communist Party, which as late as 1934 had about 6,000 members but which in the meanwhile has multiplied somewhat, has given up every policy of its own, other than that of further attenuating the workers' struggle. Like the Social Democracy, it wants nothing more than to defend capitalist democracy against fascism. On July 29, Dolores Ibarruri broadcast in Madrid for the Communist Party of Spain the declaration that "the struggle is only for a democratic, liberal and republican Spain. Spain is now passing thru her bourgeois-democratic revolution, and we communists are its vanguard." The general secretary of the Communist Party, Jose Diaz, declared, as reported by the Rundschau of August 27: "It is not a question here of setting up the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the soviets. Anyone who thinks he sees the social revolution on every street corner is no revolutionist. A revolutionist must know what he is fighting for at the given historical moment."

III

In Spain, as thruout the world, the weakness of the present-day labor movement is manifested among other things in its organizational and ideological fragmentation. Class unity and unity of action cannot be brought about merely by way of ideology, but only thru the force of circumstances, which drives the workers, regardless of all diversity of ideas and organizations, into a unified front against the common enemy. This is being conclusively demonstrated today in Spain. The fascist asaailant does not and cannot make a distinction as to which of the existing labor organizations is the more radical, which of them is to be treated with greater regard or greater brutality, but he fights against the workers and their class aspirations from an instinctive realization that these latter, and not the policy of the separate organizations, are in the last instance determining. The workers, on their part, are compelled by their instinct of self-preservation, in spite of all organizational and ideological differences, into a unified front against fascism as the direct and nearest enemy. Neither the groups of fascists nor those of the workers are allowed the time or opportunity to go their own special ways, and it is idle to ask whether the spanish workers under the present conditions should fight against fascism and for bourgeois democracy or not. So far as the workers are concerned, regardless ofthe organization to which they belong or of their ideological position, regardless of whether they take up for bourgeois-democratic, state-capitalist, anarcho-syndicalist or communist goals, they are obliged to

fight against fascism if they want not only to ward off the further worsening of their wretched position, but even to remain alive. The differences among the fascists also must be forced into the background until the common enemy, the workers and rebellious peasants, with their momentary bourgeois comrades of the coalition, are struck down. The circumstance that this unity is not a hundred-percent affair on either side does not affect the fact that it has nevertheless been brought about so far as possible in the present conditions. The force of circumstances has greater weight than the will of the various organizational talents; the general necessities overtop the specific. Still, after the close of the present struggle, no matter which side loses or wins, or even in case the civil war is long drawn out, the present unity will again fall apart. And even tho a fascist dictatorship in Spain may make unreal the fragmentation among the workers, yet in case of a victory of the leftists, the struggle of the various ideologies, with their material basis in the organizations, will come back upon the order of the day; unless--though this is not at all probable--in the course of the struggle against fascism, and thru the power of circumstances, the present labor organizations are broken up and give place to new class formations. This, the most favorable perspective, appears to be precluded by the power of tradition and the industrial backwardness, which permit at most of compromise solutions which later on may possibly constitute the basis for the formation of the unified class movement.

No doubt the struggle for the power in Spain is between three different tendencies; practically, however, the struggle has as yet been confined to the one between Fascism and Anti-Fascism, even tho there was no lack of endeavors to bring other factors into the reckoning. The reactionary forces taking up for Fascism are confronted by those of a bourgeois-democratic and social-reformist cast, tho at the same time by a movement aiming at socialism, so that each individual group is fighting against two tendencies: Fascism against Democracy "and Revolution, this Democracy" against Fascism and Revolution, the Revolution against Fascism and bourgeois democracy. In case the reaction should be struck down, then, as things now stand and unless prevented by the general exhaustion, the struggle of the bourgeois-democratic forces against those which are aiming to set aside the exploitation society must again come into the foreground. Even though the love-feast which would be a natural accompaniment of the general exhaustion and a victory of the leftists should postpone this conflict for a time, still this quarrel is bound to become once more the

dominant note in spanish politics; for neither bourgeois society nor a spanish state capitalism is in the long run capable of any progressive improvement in the position of the workers; This situation is already anticipated in the frictions within the anti-fascist front, in the mutual sabotage of socialist stalinist and anarcho-syndicalist formations,and which must become the greater the longer the civil war is drawn out, since in such conditions the real socialization is bound to spread and the social-reformist forces challenged to greater resistance.

Even though the "left" bourgeoisie may already regret having risked the struggle against the reaction, it has as yet no possibility of correcting this "mistake". It is the prisoner of a situation in which forces are operating which it is no longer capable of controlling. Even though the parliamentary labor parties may have the design of bringing the bourgeois exploitation society undamaged out of the present chaos, yet neither are they any longer capable of controlling adequately those forces whose strength has grown in the course of the struggle and which are striving for socialism.Even though the fascist assailant may prefer to spare the bourgeois interests to the full extent possible, still in order to win he is obliged to impair those interests more and more, both by reason of his own military and demagogical necessities and of what this naturally implies: the radicalizing of the workers. Even though the catalonian anarchists may still drive forward their socialization, regardless of the bourgeois-democratic limitations which Madrid would like to impose upon them, still after all they are unable to leave the Madrid Government in the lurch.And, conversely, the Socialists and Stalinists are as yet not able to take vigorous steps against the anarchists without breaking their own necks. In short, nothing remains to do at the moment, regardless of all desires to the contrary, but to bring all anti-fascist forces into action against Fascism. This situation is not sought, however, but forced, and it points with all clarity to the fact that history is determined by class struggles, and not by certain organizations,special interests, leaders or ideas.

It is necessary to take a glance at the labor organizations in Spain in order to understand the frictions within the anti-fascist front. Among these anti-fascist organizations there is, first, the Social Demo - racy which ranks as the strongest political organization of workers. It has 65,000 members and,as in other countries, is divided into fractions. It has a right and a left wing and a so-called center; this latter, however, differs so little from the right wing that

one can afford to disregard it and to speak of Right and Left. The right wing, under the leadership of Indalecio Prieto, rules the organizational apparatus; the left wing and the youth organizations which have combined with the communist youth formations are led by Largo Caballero. The trade-union organization controlled by the Social Democracy, the U.G.T. (Union General de Trabajadores), sympathizes with the left wing and regards Caballero as its Lenin. The U.G.T. has about 1,400,000 members. The S.P. and its unions are no more revolutionary than is their leader. They are "leftists" only because a part of these organizations has gone so far to the right that their denomination as socialist is now nothing more than a joke. What has remained social-democratic in the pre-war sense rates today as "left."

This "leftism" has become necessary to the Social Democracy in order to evade convulsions that might be brought about by real oppositions. The "left" character of the spanish Social Democracy is said to be manifested in the person of Caballero. Until rather recently, Caballero was nothing more nor less than a typical social-democratic trade-union bigwig. In the meanwhile, however,--to believe the current reports--he has been the seat of a miracle; the spirit of Marx and Lenin is thought to have seized him overnight with elemental force, so that he is now striving for radical solutions in the sense of the russian prototype. An attempt is being made to wipe out the man's past, as well as the past of the social-democratic movement in general. It is sought to excuse his activity as minister under Primo de Riviera and his pitiful role as minister of labor in the first republican government on the ground that as a victim of capitalist intrigues and in view of the sabotage of unfaithful subordinates he is not responsible for the pettinesses of his parliamentary, labor-fakerish past. As a matter of fact, it has become necessary, after the wretched collapse of the Social Democracy in Germany and Austria, to overcome the oppositional sentiment in the socialist parties with a somewhat more radical phraseology. The new red color which the left wing has applied to itself does not affect in the least the character and construction of these organizations, which, in spite of the more radical phrases, maintain the dictatorship of the bureaucratic apparatus over the members, and which, thru a refined system of sick benefits and insurance, tie the members of the trade unions to their bureaucrats, however corrupt these latter may be. Bureaucrats who even today can conceive of socialism only as a mastery over the workers by the State.

The pseudo-radicalism of the left S.P. is forced upon it. Caballero is not leading the masses to take more radical steps, but he is running about behind the workers in order not to be left quite out of the running. Just as that part of the bourgeoisie which found itself ready for a coalition policy with the labor parties has become the prisoner of the present situation, so the left Social Democracy is being forced to a more radical policy thru the circumstances of the struggle of the armed workers; but the Social Democracy, like the left bourgeoisie, is ready to march backward again at the first opportunity. Caballero and the S.P. are not fighting for socialism; they are attempting, with social-democratic demagogy, to maintain capitalist society in its present form, and in case this capitalist society nevertheless goes under, instead of a communist society to build up a state capitalism which would mean little more for the workers than the state capitalism of Stalin or Hitler.

The Communist Party of Spain (Third International) is no more than the tail-end of the S.P. It claims to have 50,000 members, which is certainly a gross exaggeration. The C.P. exercises its greatest influence in Madrid and Vizcaya. As in France, so also in Spain its policy is determined by the necessities of russian foreign policy. Structure and character are the same as in all other communist parties. Like the S.P., also the C.P. has endeavored either to prevent the manifestations of the workers or, where they were not preventible, to stifle them as quickly as possible. Azana's liberal government was regarded by the C.P. as an ally of France, and since France was the ally of Russia, the spanish communists felt called upon, in the interest of the russian block policy for the coming war, to support the spanish government insofar as possible and to protect it against the dangers from right and left. The influence of the C.P. in Spain, however, is slight. With its subordination to the S.P., it can hardly receive consideration any more as a special organization.

The "right" and "left" oppositional groups which broke away some years ago from the official Communist Party, in order later to merge into the Partido Obrero de Unificacion Marxista (P.O.U.M.), and which are usually designated as "Trotskists", represent within the spanish movement the line of the "genuine" Bolshevik-Leninists. Their noise is greater than their influence; they have, according to their own data, about 8,000 members; their Lenins and Trotskys go by the names of Maurin and Andrade. The principal influence of the organization is in Barcelona, where it publishes two weekly papers: La Batalla in the spanish language, and

Front in the catalonian. The struggle of the "false" Leninists and their social-democratic allies against the P.O.U.M. has compelled the latter to draw closer to the anarcho-syndicalist movement than can commonly be expected of Leninists. This friendliness is, of course, truly Leninist and in practice extremely childish, carried on with the idea of bringing the anarcho-syndicalist movement under the influence of the P.O.U.M. Thus Juan Andrade writes in the September number of Plebs: "In Catalonia, which has always been a stronghold of anarchism, it begins to lose influence to the Marxist parties and especially to the P.O.U.M.....The revolution can be victorious only if the Marxist parties are able to assimilate the numerous anarchist workers. This is the key to the future for Spain." The fact that the P.O.U.M. still speaks of other "Marxist" organizations is a sufficient indication that it still today regards the S.P. and C.P. as revolutionary movements to which it feels more closely bound than to the anarcho-syndicalist workers. This is equivalent to saying that the P.O.U.M. also is rather to be set down in the camp of the bourgeois-democratic (or state-capitalist) elements than to be embraced among the workers struggling for socialism, however hazy may be their programs. It is true that the P.O.U.M. takes a position against the coalition policy of the popular-front parties; but it will not take a position against a spanish state capitalism after the russian model, just as it also still today understands by the dictatorship of the proletariat only that of the bolshevist party.

Over against these "marxist" organizations, which have nothing more in common with Marxism than the name, stands the anarcho-syndicalist movement, which, even though it has not the organizational strength of the popular-front parties, can nevertheless be rated as their worthy adversary, capable of bringing into question the aspirations of the pseudo-marxist state capitalists.

Spanish anarchism has a long history. The labor organizations which were formed in 1869 and influenced by Bakunin soon won great influence both in the industrially more developed parts of the peninsula, mainly in Catalonia, as well as in the most backward parts among the farm workers of Andalusia. The socialist organizations arising later were never in a position to break the influence of the earlier anarchist movement. Later on, the anarchist organizations absorbed the ideas of the french syndicalists, and with the growing industrialization of Spain, which gave added importance to the struggle for day-to-day demands, the anarcho-syndicalist movement in Spain grew

very rapidly. In 1911 the syndicalists organized the Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo (C.N.T.), which first loosely combined the various trade unions and then the more recently formed industrial unions, the syndicatos unicos.

In 1914 the C.N.T. had 25,000 members; only four years later, 500,000; in 1923, a million; and in 1931, approximately 1,500,000. Though the C.N.T. is under the influence of the anarchists, it nevertheless accepts all workers without regard to their ideological position. Thru the influence of the russian revolution, the anarchists lost temporarily, in 1919, the control over the C.N.T. which even decided to become a member of the Third International and to come out for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the russian sense. This led to embittered inner struggles, and finally the influence of the anarchists in the C.N.T. was again asserted. In the years of Primo de Riviera's dictatorship --which, of course, did not strike the socialists so that they were enabled to grow at the expense of the anarchists--there arose the anarchist illegal organizations which in 1931, under the name of the Federacion Anarquista Iberica (F.A.I.) with a membership of about 10,000, obtained control over the C.N.T. In the fruitless uprisings of the years 1931-33 the anarchists sought to win the power in Spain. These rebellions, which were poorly organized and not very clear as to their aims, led to splits. A part of the unions left the C.N.T. and organized the "Libertarian Syndicalist Federation" which has a membership of about 40,000. In 1934 Angel Pestana began the formation of the Syndicalist Party, whose program is in large part copied from that of the parliamentary socialist labor movement.

Thru the defeats of the anarchists in the attempts at uprising and thru the resulting splits in the movement, as also by reason of the persecutions at the hands of the reaction as well as of liberalism and the reformist labof organizations connected with this latter, the anarchists lost further influence and their membership dwindled. Today the C.N.T. has a membership of about 600,000. During the October uprising (1934), the catalonian anarchists sabotaged the revolutionary movement. In Asturias, however, they fought together with the revolutionary workers, and in splendid manner. The attitude of the catalonian anarchists in October 1934, however much to be condemned, is explained by the fact that the "leftist" government of Catalonia had forced the C.N.T. to go underground, that it brutally persecuted the anarchists, that even upon the outbreak of the uprising which was supported by the catalonian government, it still failed to give up the struggle against the anarcho-syndicalists. The hatred which

Front in the catalonian. The struggle of the "false" Leninists and their social-democratic allies against the P.O.U.M. has compelled the latter to draw closer to the anarcho-syndicalist movement than can commonly be expected of Leninists. This friendliness is, of course, truly Leninist and in practice extremely childish, carried on with the idea of bringing the anarcho-syndicalist movement under the influence of the P.O.U.M. Thus Juan Andrade writes in the September number of Plebs: "In Catalonia, which has always been a stronghold of anarchism, it begins to lose influence to the Marxist parties and especially to the P.O.U.M.....The revolution can be victorious only if the Marxist parties are able to assimilate the numerous anarchist workers. This is the key to the future for Spain." The fact that the P.O.U.M. still speaks of other "Marxist" organizations is a sufficient indication that it still today regards the S.P. and C.P. as revolutionary movements to which it feels more closely bound than to the anarcho-syndicalist workers. This is equivalent to saying that the P.O.U.M. also is rather to be set down in the camp of the bourgeois-democratic (or state-capitalist) elements than to be embraced among the workers struggling for socialism, however hazy may be their programs. It is true that the P.O.U.M. takes a position against the coalition policy of the popular-front parties; but it will not take a position against a spanish state capitalism after the russian model, just as it also still today understands by the dictatorship of the proletariat only that of the bolshevist party.

Over against these "marxist" organizations, which have nothing more in common with Marxism than the name, stands the anarcho-syndicalist movement, which, even though it has not the organizational strength of the popular-front parties, can nevertheless be rated as their worthy adversary, capable of bringing into question the aspirations of the pseudo-marxist state capitalists.

Spanish anarchism has a long history. The labor organizations which were formed in 1869 and influenced by Bakunin soon won great influence both in the industrially more developed parts of the peninsula, mainly in Catalonia, as well as in the most backward parts among the farm workers of Andalusia. The socialist organizations arising later were never in a position to break the influence of the earlier anarchist movement. Later on, the anarchist organizations absorbed the ideas of the french syndicalists, and with the growing industrialization of Spain, which gave added importance to the struggle for day-to-day demands, the anarcho-syndicalist movement in Spain grew

very rapidly. In 1911 the syndicalists organized the Confederacion Nacional de Trabajo (C.N.T.), which first loosely combined the various trade unions and then the more recently formed industrial unions, the syndicatos unicos.

In 1914 the C.N.T. had 25,000 members; only four years later, 500,000; in 1923, a million; and in 1931, approximately 1,500,000. Though the C.N.T. is under the influence of the anarchists, it nevertheless accepts all workers without regard to their ideological position. Thru the influence of the russian revolution, the anarchists lost temporarily, in 1919, the control over the C.N.T. which even decided to become a member of the Third International and to come out for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the russian sense. This led to embittered inner struggles, and finally the influence of the anarchists in the C.N.T. was again asserted. In the years of Primo de Riviera's dictatorship --which, of course, did not strike the socialists so that they were enabled to grow at the expense of the anarchists--there arose the anarchist illegal organizations which in 1931, under the name of the Federacion Anarquista Iberica (F.A.I.) with a membership of about 10,000, obtained control over the C.N.T. In the fruitless uprisings of the years 1931-33 the anarchists sought to win the power in Spain. These rebellions, which were poorly organized and not very clear as to their aims, led to splits. A part of the unions left the C.N.T. and organized the "Libertarian Syndicalist Federation" which has a membership of about 40,000. In 1934 Angel Pestana began the formation of the Syndicalist Party, whose program is in large part copied from that of the parliamentary socialist labor movement.

Thru the defeats of the anarchists in the attempts at uprising and thru the resulting splits in the movement, as also by reason of the persecutions at the hands of the reaction as well as of liberalism and the reformist labof organizations connected with this latter, the anarchists lost further influence and their membership dwindled. Today the C.N.T. has a membership of about 600,000. During the October uprising (1934), the catalonian anarchists sabotaged the revolutionary movement. In Asturias, however, they fought together with the revolutionary workers, and in splendid manner. The attitude of the catalonian anarchists in October 1934, however much to be condemned, is explained by the fact that the "leftist" government of Catalonia had forced the C.N.T. to go underground, that it brutally persecuted the anarchists, that even upon the outbreak of the uprising which was supported by the catalonian government, it still failed to give up the struggle against the anarcho-syndicalists. The hatred which

this "leftist" government and its following had aroused in the ranks of the anarchists furnished occasion for these latter to sabotage the uprising and so to share in the blame for the October defeat.

After the setting up of the popular-front government--which of course had the partial support of the anarchists who participated in the elections for the sake of freeing the 30,000 political prisoners--it was left for the C.N.T. alone to carry on the struggle of the workers for the improvement of their position in life, since the coalition policy of the C.P. and S.P. made it impossible for these organizations to compromise, by way of workers' demonstrations, the situation of the coalition partners. In May 1936 the C.N.T. addressed the U.G.T. with a proposal for the forming of "revolutionary alliances", but continued to refuse all cooperation with the political labor parties. It soon found itself, by reason of its continuance of the struggle against the exploiters, in bitter opposition to the Popular Front. The hatred of the popular-front parties for the anarchists was recently still expressed after nearly a month of struggle against Fascism, in an interview with Deputy Juan Hernandez, editor of the communist-party Mundo-Obrero, as follows: "As for the anarchists, who prefer the rear guard to the line of fire, you must not attach too much importance to them. Their intentions are not clear, but the spanish people thru its official organisms will fix them. We do not want to know anything about those libertarian communists. They will be attended to the day after victory. Right now it is impossible to do anything against elements fighting at our side."

Owing to the tardiness of the capitalist development in Spain, the predominance of small enterprises, the provincialism, and also to the prominence of the question of nationalities and the great cleft between the more developed parts of the peninsula and the rest of the country, the federal-autonomistic character of the spanish anarcho-syndicalist movement has been promoted and preserved. The centralism of the Social Democracy of both tendencies means at the same time, in Spain, centralistic control by way of Madrid, and was accordingly never able to find much response among the national minorities of Spain to whom Madrid is in poor repute. This is especially so in the stronghold of anarchism, in Catalonia. Isolated local manifestations were not only the product of a self-restricting philosophy, but the only form of action which for a long while has been practically possible. The thing that in more highly developed countries would be a weakness of the movement was here in part a source of strength. The state of disorganization of the ruling class did

not require the central control and direction of the workers' manifestations in such measure as is necessary in the capitalistically developed countries. The localizing of the workers manifestations was rather an inevitable product of the circumstance that only industrial oases existed in the feudal desert. At any rate, it was the spanish relations themselves,not the anarchist philosophy, which forms the secret of the development and preservation of the federal-syndicalist fighting methods and organizations. In the course of the further industrializing of Spain, this syndicalist movement likewise will be obliged, regardless of its previous attitude, to take up with more coordinated and centralized forms of organization, if it is not to go under. Or, possibly, the centralistic control and coordination of all political and economic activity will be imposed overnight by a successful revolution; and in these circumstances the federalistic traditions would be of enormous value, since they would form the necessary counter-weight against the dangers of centralism. Not least important, the C.N.T. has hitherto been able to preserve its special character by reason of the social-reformist and anti-revolutionary attitude of the pseudo-marxist parties. In contrast to these organizations, the discipline in the C.N.T. is not a compulsory but a voluntary one, even though the conditions preclude from time to time the strict adherence to this principle. Anchored in this organization is the conception, however often it may have been violated, that the revolution can be made only from below, thru the spontaneous action and the self-initiative of the workers. Parliamentarism and labor-leader economy is looked upon as labor fakery, and state capitalism is set on the same plane with any other kind of exploitation society. In the course of the present civil war, anarcho-syndicalism has been the most forward-driving revolutionary element, endeavoring to convert the revolutionary phrase into reality.

The organizational and ideological fragmentation of the spanish proletariat, although a result of the previous development, beclouds the immediate future of Spain. It has weakened the striking power of the workers, and points rather -- even from a purely national standpoint, without regard to the complications involved in the international field -- to the hopelessness than to the success of a real revolution by which the workers would be liberated.

IV

The proletarian revolution is necessarily international. It will have to begin in one country, but will be obliged to expire again unless it is propagated over a num-

ber of countries and develops forces capable of successfully withstanding a decisive struggle with international capital. Even a revolution which goes no farther than state capitalism can maintain itself nationally against the private-economy countries only in specially favorable circumstances. So long as the russian revolution, for example, failed to reveal clearly in which direction it was marching, the capitalist intervention tried to give it the bum's rush. It was not until the establishment of a strong government and the unequivocal course to state capitalism that the international bourgeoisie became reconciled to the new russian conditions. That is to say that in addition to the war weariness in the capitalist countries and the rivalries between the imperialist powers, the compromise between world capital and russian state capitalism was based on the consideration that the state capitalism signifies no direct revolutionary danger to the other countries, since bargains could be made even with such a Russia .

As regards present-day Spain, however, the situation is different. The broad masses of the capitalist countries play, for the present, no role in its decisions; they are sufficiently prepared for a new world slaughter, and their oppositional possibilities are stifled. With or without Spain, the imperialist powers are arming for a new war; and even though individual nations may be interested in the further postponement of the war, still this new world-slaughter can break out at any time. Open capitalist intervention in Spain would at once conflict with the imperialist rivalries, insofar as they relate to the spanish territory, to Morocco and to the mediterranean interests. Unless it were carried through jointly by all the nations, it would issue directly in the new world war. The fronts of the imperialist groups of powers are, however, not yet clearly established. Particularly in Asia, with regard to China and a possible change in the asiatic policy of England, alterations of the situation are still possible which make a postponement of the world war an asset for Russia and France. The franco-russian war block, as well as England, is not interested in the immediate outbreak of the war; they are waiting for more favorable circumstances and have need of still further arming and coördinating. The prevention of open intervention and the postponement of the otherwise seemingly imminent war was served by the non-intervention proposal of France with reference to the spanish civil war, a proposal which was also accepted by the imperialist rivals. The real meaning of the neutrality pact consists in breaking the back of the spanish revolution without, for the present, becoming involved in a new war.

The imperialist interests of England are closely bound

up with all the proceedings in Spain. Gibraltar is not sufficient to protect adequately the ocean route to India; this ocean route might be endangered from Ceuta and the Balearic Islands. It is for this reason that with the beginning of the tension between Italy and England there began also the english fortification of those islands. If Spain should incline to Italy, England would have received the second slap in the face at the hands of Italy since the beginning of the abyssinian conflict. The possibility that a spanish fascism would go along with Mussolini, a question with which Italy is obviously concerned, cannot be tolerated by England. That the discord between the english and italian interests is by no means laid aside becomes clear from the acceptance of Abyssinia into the League of Nations, as also from the english troop transports to Palestine. On the other hand, however, England has likewise no interest in a Spain subscribing to the franco-russian front, for the english interests in Asia still coincide with those of Japan, even though this union already begins to relax. Any support of Russia and France would be directed against Japan and Germany, and is not yet in conformity with the interests of England. The greater an empire, the greater the complications and difficulties, but the more cautious also the policy. And by the side of all the difficulties already mentioned, there also looms in the background the danger represented by America. And so the english interest in Spain is restricted to helping in bringing forth a policy there which is subordinated neither to Rome nor to Moscow. Hence the necessity of preventing open intervention on the part of the fascist powers, and at the same time strangling the revolution which might be put to use for franco-russian purposes. The french neutrality pact was agreeable to english policy, or at any rate left England with time and leisure for later decisions. To be sure, probably no one believed that german and italian fascism, even upon acceptance of the neutrality pact, would discontinue arming the spanish fascists, or that the italian and german imperialist interests in Spain and Morocco would be laid to sleep, but at any rate the neutrality pact was able to serve in postponing war in Europe. No doubt this postponement was accomplished at the expense of France and England; still, in politics also, the old saying holds true: Who laughs last, laughs best! The advantages won by Italy and Germany could also be looked upon as a sort of compensation for the slaughtering services rendered against the spanish revolution. Capitalist intervention had occurred without having occasioned war. The french neutrality pact, accepted by the democratic powers unreservedly, by the fascist ones with various reserves, was the licence delivered to Fascism for striking down the spanish revolution with-

out danger. This situation was regarded also by Russia, who accepted the neutrality pact, as the lesser evil with respect to a present war.

Even though the imperialist powers decided to accept the non-intervention proposal, still its carrying out is another matter. The situation is still capable of changing. A too far-going aggression on the part of Italy or Germany, speculating on the momentary unwillingness for war, an overstepping of the activities in Spain which have been tacitly assured them, can also cause those powers which are not yet willing to make war, to make a sudden reversal of their policy and thus, after all, still bring this war about.

If the spanish fascists should not succeed within a reasonable time in establishing "law and order", the open capitalist intervention may still come about. If the workers' revolution should become consolidated, and if it should strike down fascism as well as the Popular Front, there would still be the possibility that all the capitalist nations, or a special one at the order of all the others, would strike down the revolution while avoiding war between the imperialist rivals. It is also not absolutely precluded that the intervening powers would undertake a partition of Spain in accordance with the various imperialist spheres of interest, in which connection Catalonia as an "independent" power would possibly be placed under the protective rule of England and France, and the rest of the country would be left to the fascist states. It is even possible that a spanish fascism by which the country would be held together would subscribe, in spite of the german-italian support, to the interests of France and England. In short, the constellation of powers for the new war still admits of a great number of alterations by which Spain also is affected, and which may go so far as the apparently absurd combination of Germany and France, so that any speculation as to the immediate future in this respect seems out of order.

One thing, however, is clear: the international bourgeoisie shows by its actions to date with respect to Spain that it would not in any case leave the victory there to a workers' revolution. There is nothing strange about that. Anyone who imagines that international capital would tolerate a workers' revolution is ready for the madhouse. International capital has no illusions regarding the spanish situation. It knows that it is nonsense to speak of the "completion" of the bourgeois revolution, in which all the liberal-democratic powers thruout the world are said to be interested. What such a "completion" of the "bourgeois

revolution" means in the most favorable case the russian revolution has sufficiently served to make clear. The nonsense of the struggle for "bourgeois democracy" is manifest today, when one after the other of the bourgeois democracies goes fascist. The socialist-liberal-communist watchwords in Spain are hokum. It is not a question there of democracy; even this "democracy" is fighting only to decide the question as to which particular social group is to exercise the dictatorship over the workers and the control over the other social groups. The exploitation societies of today are compelled to the greatest centralization and concentration of all economic and political power, if they want to assert themselves in the imperialist hurly-burly or even so much as to maintain order at home within the framework of the present economic conditions of the world. Like any other "democracy", the spanish also would forthwith, or at least soon, be governing with fascist methods. Even where monopoly capital is weak, there is still no assurance for democracy; monopolization must, in that case, be artificially accelerated by the government in order that the exploitation society may be kept intact. It is only the workers who are still in a position to bring about a democratic state of affairs, though only within the framework of the communist economy. Neither Liberalism nor Fascism understands by the "completion of the bourgeois revolution" anything other than the concentration of all wealth and all power into the hands of fewer and fewer persons.

The bourgeoisie of the world has no illusions regarding the struggle in Spain. Thus the conservative London Times writes: "Should the revolt triumph, a fascist regime would be the result, against which rebellion would continue until drowned in blood. Should the sedition be suppressed, the Liberal Republic of 1931 must perish in the process. Two extremes are at each other's throats. One must succumb. There is no central force strong enough to separate them. . . .The die was cast. All thought of temporizing with the insurgents and the classes they represented was abandoned. . . . . 'Committees of workers' have taken over the big railway companies. It seems only a question of time for this to happen to the trams, the banks and other key establishments. A decree promulgated by the Government to take control of all industries in the interests of the State looks like a forlorn attempt to forestall these occupations."

If the present socialist-communist popular-front government were still, after all, to succeed by means of the nationalization hokum in rescuing the bourgeois exploitation society, they will not be rescuing democracy, but

they themselves will have to take over, with the victory over Fascism, the fascist functions; they will then be obliged once more to fulfill the tasks of Noske-Socialism.

Even though a number of the powers may continue to prefer a "liberal" dictatorship to the fascist one, and accordingly hope that the tide may turn in favor of the Popular Front, still as soon as the dictatorship of the proletariat is actually exercised, to these countries also the fascist dictatorship will appear as a lesser evil. Nor on this point will the franco-russian interests constitute an exception. A communist Spain would mean the carrying of the civil war to France. The spanish communist revolution must press over the spanish boundaries or else it cannot live. Even though, as things now stand, it is almost out of the question that the french workers will take an active part in the present civil war on the side of the spanish workers, still attempts of this sort, occasioned by the fairly long existence of a proletarian dictatorship in Spain, may lead to domestic disorders in France which would enormously weaken the latter's military potentialities and very largely depreciate her value as an ally of Russia. A spanish fascism, on the contrary, can strengthen the national-military power of France by way of the demagogic utilization of the danger by which she would then be menaced from the west as well as the east.

This situation is already anticipated in the endeavors of the Communist Party of France to make of the french Popular Front the National Front; it also finds expression in the hypocritical demand for the violation of the neutrality pact, a demand which is evidence at the same time that the Communist International is convinced that Fascism in Spain has already won. Even though the Comintern has no objection to that, still this situation must be put to use for russian interests. Fascism in Spain, even if directed against France, and in spite of the eventual necessity of securing the french boundaries in the west as well as the east, is nevertheless a better guarantee for Russia and France than a communist Spain. Not only because the military forces of Spain are not very much of an asset to the adversaries of France and Russia, not only because England would thereby be driven more to the side of Russia and France, but quite as much so because the french unity would in this way be better secured, because the pact with Russia would seem less endangered. A spanish communism might, under certain circumstances, undermine the entire french Popular Front. It might carry the civil war to France, and, with a victory of the french fascists, mean a complete reorientation of french policy.

The financial and military aid received by spanish fascism at the hands of international capital is no secret. There is no doubt that the military successes of the fascists and the repulse of the workers is the direct result of the armament supplied by Germany and Italy. It is also clear that in view of the inner situation, the spanish fascists alone would not have been able to break the power of the government and of the workers and force them to take the defensive and probably to suffer defeat. While the openly fascist part of the capitalist nations made no secret of its synpathies for the spanish fascists, that part which has the design of leading the workers into the new world slaughter under the slogan "For Democracy and Against Fascism" is compelled, in order to hold the workers in leash, to weep bitter crocodile tears for Spain. The "communists" are even compelled to make a show of opposition to the neutrality pact in order to obviate the danger that the workers may see thru their treacherous game. This opposition is not calculated to violate the neutrality, but to secure its further existence. The unrest among the french workers was already too great; the Communist Party was compelled to make a gesture in favor of the spanish revolution. The collections of money and foodstuffs, the protests of scholars and literary men were not sufficient; a new wave of strikes in France seemed also to be about to take note of the spanish situation. In order to prevent deeds, it was necessary to make phrases; this critical situation was to be overcome with the aid of demagogy. To be sure, it sank to the level of the peasant-catching stupidity of Moscow court proceedings, and there might be amusement if there were not at the same time so much that is sickening in observing the paid and unpaid communist Jesuits engaged in their endeavors to slobber themselves out of the fix into which the neutrality pact had gotten them.

At the time the non-intervention proposal was made by the Blum Government, the C.P. found not a word of criticism, but sought to make clear to the workers that the Blum policy was , after all, in harmony with the workers' interests. To take one of a great number of examples, the New York Daily Worker wrote, on August 20: "There is more than the question of the Blum government's assistance to a friendly government beset by Fascism. There is the question of a world war....True, neither Mussolini nor Hitler needs any pretext for their bloodthirsty deeds. Yet, the Blum government has to gauge its tactics to a threefold perspective: First, there are the inner relations with the Radical Socialists. The french Fascists are manoeuvering with the extreme Right of the Radical Socialists to create a government crisis. In France there is the threat of

civil war at home...Second, British imperialism would be swung over to fascist Germany and Italy in the event of direct, open military aid to the Spanish government. Third, decisive aid might mean imminent world war. . . . The Communist Party of France has roundly criticized Blum. But it does not take the stand that (because of its non-intervention policy) an open, splitting attack should be made to wreck the Blum government." And this "criticism", which aimed at nothing, was preceded by a vote of confidence in the french Chamber for the Blum government and its neutrality policy, a vote in which the communist party block joined. It was not until later that the party adopted a somewhat different tone, or at least expressed itself in a different sort of phraseology. Thus on August 28th, the same Daily Worker wrote: "Such 'neutrality' means giving aid to the victory of fascism in Spain. It means help for the victory of Hitler and Mussolini....." And the London Daily Worker of August 15th wrote: "The policy of neutrality is treason to democracy and peace, to the interests of the peoples of Spain, France and Britain, especially...It only helps the fascist murderers against the spanish people." And still earlier, notwithstanding the later defense of Blum in the New York Daily Worker, we read in the Imprecor of August 8th: "A neutral policy of all democratic States . . . would be the policy most agreeable to the interests of Hitler and Mussolini."

Nevertheless--the Soviet Union, the Fatherland of All Workers, the bulwark of peace, the stronghold against Fascism, accepted the neutrality pact and thereby, in the words of its own organs, joined up with those States which are helping Hitler and Mussolini, betraying the interests of the people and endangering the peace. And not only that; they betray, also, the national interests of France, as witness the french C.P. in the Rundschau of August 6th: "The victory of this splendid spanish people means the security of France in the Pyrenees and in North Africa; the assured effectualness of the defense in the east and also the security of England. France could not tolerate a triumph of the spanish insurrectionists with aid from abroad. Against the betrayal! For France! For freedom and for peace! Frenchmen, let us unite! "

The Communist Party of France and the russian wielders of power have not, as might appear from these quotations, gone crazy. They are merely playing a double game. They see two eventualities and want to be set for both. On the one hand, they support the neutrality pact in order to postpone the war; on the other, they want to assure themselves of the masses in case the war, nevertheless, breaks out. The special repulsiveness

of this Janus face is explained by the needs of russian foreign policy.

The Social Democrats and trade-union leaders,who are under no obligation to Russia, had an easier time of it. That is, they merely declared themselves in sympathy with the (fatal for Spain) non-intervention policy of their bourgeoisies. Though of course in view of their trade-mark "labor movement", these worthy fellows saw themselves obligated to send bandaging materials and medical supplies for the dead spanish revolutionists.

And thus world capitalism, inclusive of the russian edition, endeavored to put an end to the spanish revolution, in part thru intervention, and in part thru non-intervention. In this endeavor, these various capitalisms have had the full support of the old labor movement. Thus the entire world is directing itself against a few hundred thousand spanish revolutionists, and these latter are thereby directing themselves against the entire world. An unequal struggle....But the spanish revolutionists have no choice; however unpromising their position, they have to continue flinging their dynamite against the world.

V

Upon the outbreak of the fascist uprising, the popular-front government forthwith lost its head. Prime Minister Quiroga, at the suggestion of Azana, resigned. Martinez Barrio was commissioned to form a new government. He made the proposal of entering into a compromise with the rebellious army, but it was turned down by Prieto and Caballero. The leaders of the labor movement realized that any compromise would mean nothing more than going over to fascism without a struggle,and thereby also to their end. They further knew that such a decision would have had no effect on the bloody settlement of the fascists with the workers. On July 19th, three governments were formed, one after the other, and the last combination decided in favor of arming the workers and creating the militia. This decision was, however, only the ratification of already accomplished facts. A large proportion of the workers had armed themselves without waiting for the government's decision. They besieged the barracks of the insurrectionist troops and by their self-initiative secured for the government the cities of Malaga, Barcelona, Madrid, Toledo, Bilbao and San Sebastian.Without this action on the part of the workers, the popular-front government would have been swept away forthwith, since in addition to the army a part of the police and of the Guardia Civil joined the fascists,

and even the loyal part was not very reliable.

With the consolidation of the anti-fascist forces, the popular-front government endeavored to take control of the streets out of the hands of the workers' militia in order not to endanger the security of capitalist society. Mass pressure, however, forced it to make new concessions to the workers, and the successful advances of the fascist troops, which went so far as the occupation of Irun and San Sebastian, led to a new shake-up in the government, which now brought in the socialists and communists. Premiership and war were now under Caballero, navy and aviation under Prieto, education under Hernandez. The rest of the posts were divided among other socialists and left republicans.

After almost two months of embittered civil war, this "radical" government still summed up its tasks and designs, as reported by the communist Mundo Obrero of September 5th, as follows: "The present government has the enthusiastic support of forces of the country ranging from the nationalistic Catholics to the comrades of the C.N.T. It is the government of the people's will. Around it are concentrated all the forces of democracy and of anti-fascism. It will attain victory because it will create a great popular army, unify the command and make rapid and appropriate use of all the armed elements of the people. It will bring into being comprehensive agrarian reform and will be of assistance to small ownership in industry and commerce, and to all production which serves the purposes of the nation. It will institute for the working people social insurance, maximum hours and minimum wages, relief of unemployment, illness and old age, and at the same time extend to the utmost limit the protection afforded to the labor of women and children. It is a government which will respect all religious convictions and the freedom of religion within the framework of the democratic republic in regard to all those who respect the popular will and the laws of the Republic. It will recognize the rights of the nations existing in Spain-Catalonia, the Basque Provinces and Galicia--and establish extensive democratic liberties for Morocco and the other colonies."

But the will of this government, by the side of a better agrarian reform and a social-insurance law a la Roosevelt and Leon Blum, "to be of assistance to small ownership in industry and commerce and to all production which serves the purposes of the nation," that is, the will of the government to protect capitalist property and to rescue bourgeois society, no longer meant very much, for this government had practically ceased to govern; the power was already in the hands of the armed workers. The government's "social" program, which had in

mind going "to the utmost limit", as to the exact location of which the government itself was to be the judge, has the appearance of a bad joke in view of the hundred thousand among the workers who died under machine-gun fire. Whether the government's will can still mean anything depends, as the New York Times of August 18th wrote, on whether "this army of ragged irregulars can be persuaded to surrender their arms." In view of this situation, and in spite of all the kind words of the government, such wavering petty-bourgeois elements as had not already taken the step went over into the camp of fascism. At the same time, the popular-front government played a double game. Even though it did not dare to proceed generally and openly against the armed formations of workers under their own leadership and which were slipping from its control--though in localities where the socialists and the Guardia Civil had the upper hand, attempts were made at disarming the anarcho-syndicalist workers--still the government's aversion fo this militia greatly endangered the anti-fascist struggle. In fact, the government's apprehension of a real workers' rule went all the way to direct sabotage of the anti-fascist struggle. Catalonia, which is completely in the hands of the workers, proposed to proceed against the fascist-controlled Saragossa; it failed, however, to obtain the consent or support of the Madrid Government, since Saragossa has constantly been a center of anarchism, and the liberation of the revolutionary forces held captive there would have still further weakened the position of the Popular Front against the workers' revolution. The otherwise "strictly neutral" France was, in this connection, even ready, in accordance with the request of the Madrid Government, to transport the anarchist troops of Barcelona across France to Irun in the hope that the power of the catalonian workers' revolution would thereby be weakened.

In contrast to the popular-front government, the workers of the C.N.T. have comprehended that the struggle concerns other matters than the transfer of the Blum policy onto spanish conditions. After the outbreak of the uprising, an anarchist conference which was held to take a position on the revolutionary situation, summed the matter up somewhat as follows: "....The common enemy, incarnated in the seditious militarism, must be crushed first of all. The anarchists must therefore continue to form part of the anti-fascist Committees, while at the same time striving to influence them in order that the struggle may not lose its virile and radical character, and so as to prevent them from entering into political combinations for which the people would subsequently have to pay the expenses. In view of the bankruptcy of bourgeois

economy and democracy, the social problem requires new solutions, The workers' organizations, particularly the C.N.T. and the anarchist movement, must materialize a complete work of economic reconstruction, from the collectivization to the socialization of the land, of the mines and of industry. In brief, the Plenun declares that the revolutionary work is not a mere matter of the violent collision with the reactionary forces of the bourgeoisie, but must be extended to the whole of modern life."

And in another proclamation to the workers of the world, published in the information bulletin of the C.N.T. and F.A.I. of August 15, 1936, these organizations once more emphasize that "contrary to the contentions of the political party sections of the spanish workers' movement, . . . it must be stated that the struggle depends, above all, on the heroism, the fighting spirit and the numerical strength of the anarchist workers of Spain.....We have desired to maintain the unity of the anti-fascist front above all,and we have confined ourselves to exerting our influence thruout the life of Catalonia by creating economic and shop councils for regulating the whole economic life of society, and which are the bases of the social organization of the future."

With the arming of the workers in Catalonia, the influence of the popular-front government in that region had declined to zero. The workers organized themselves in centuries, elected their own soldiers' councils, their own "officers". The government occasionally called upon the workers to surrender their arms, "since of course the factory workers have no need of being armed"; yet the C.N.T. and F.A.I. gave out the word to keep the arms under all circumstances, as being the only reliable security--they even went so far as to call upon the workers to shoot anyone forthwith who sought to disarm them.

The spanish revolution receives from Barcelona its true character. If the miners of the Asturias succeed in getting out of the claws of the fascists, the revolution will roll on to Madrid and create in Spain a wholly different situation. Then the spanish struggle will dispense with the last bourgeois phrases and come to light as a struggle between Capital and Labor.

Even though Prieto, as late as the middle of September, magnanimously proclaimed that "in these bloody weeks the masses have won the right to demand a new State organized for them", the masses will probably after all fail to understand the enticement of nothing more than a new goverrment as the only result of their huge sac-

rifices. Even in Madrid, though hindered in large measure at the hands of the parliamentary labor parties, the revolution has made progress. Goods and real estate belonging to fascist elements and refugee capitalists were expropriated. To prevent the "wild" expropriations from spreading, the government was forced to convert private property into state property. Hotels and club houses were transformed into hospitals, workers' homes and schools. Property belonging to orders was confiscated; concessions made in relation to wages, working conditions and hours. Later a sort of workers' control was introduced into the enterprises. The government is obliged to make more and more concessions in order not to be swept away, but its previous procrastination shows with all clarity that it has to be overthrown if the workers' revolution is to proceed.

As late as September 18th, the Madrid Government rejects the proposals of the anarcho-syndicalists for the consolidation of the revolutionary front. The anarchist proposal to grant to the workers' committees the right to participate in the establishment and carrying out of all economico-political and military measures is rejected at the hands of the socialist-communist government which "under no circumstances tolerates such a duality of power." Rejected also are the proposals for the immediate socialization of the banks, railways and industry, and to proceed with the complete confiscation of church property. The demand that all public authority be conveyed to the workers' militia is turned down, and likewise the demand for bringing all workers into the militia for the decisive struggle against fascism. The workers are not to govern; the government continues to hope that it will become master of the situation without conferring too much power upon the workers, the enemies of tomorrow. The politicians in power are apprehensive of a gigantic workers' army, continue to busy themselves with patching together the remains of the old amy to which they had managed to hold on, and to supplement it with the militia, preventing the combination from becoming anything more than the army of the government. The workers, however, have too long had the opportunity to feel on their own bodies the functions of the various government soldieries. They have no confidence in the government's soldiers. They refuse to be taken into the strictly military formations. Their motto is: Militiamen, yes; combatants, yes; soldiers, never!

On August 19th, Catalonia declared its complete independence of Madrid. This separation from the central government, altho in the line of the leninist policy as to nationalities, and altho a revolutionary element in the one-sided sense that it weakened the position

of the popular-front government, is nevertheless of a petty-bourgeois and capitalistic nature. The propaganda with which it was accompanied, for a "union of independent spanish socialist republics", does not do away with the anti-revolutionary character of the demand for national independence. National problems behind which are concealed special interests of a material nature belong to exploitation society. The proletariat can make no concessions to nationalism without doing immense damage to its class interests.

Catalonia is the wealthiest of the spanish provinces and was accordingly always obliged to turn over in taxes to the Madrid government more than it received from Madrid in the way of concessions. It was obliged, that is, to make a contribution for the poorer provinces; a state of affairs from which it sought release. Later on, nationalism became the instrument of catalan industry for the purpose of extorting tariff concessions. The middle class is nationalistic because it wants to monopolize for itself the administrative and public offices. The parliamentary labor movement was unable to attack the nationalist ideology for fear of losing its influence among the workers, who likewise are under the sway of this ideology. The anarcho-syndicalist movement sought to make use of the separatist currents for revolutionary purposes. The splitting up of Spain has ever appeared to the anarchists merely as the shattering of the power of the central government; and since such separatism is not in direct contradiction to their federalistic philosophy, they saw in the furthering of it no hindrance to the materialization of their socialist ideas. Such a position on the subject is obviously nonsense and shows the unrealistic character of the anarcho-syndicalist movement as well as its naivete with respect to the laws of economic development. For the partition of Spain into small independent republics would render politically and economically impossible any attempt at socialization. A socialist Catalonia is impossible in a capitalist Spain. Socialism thruout the country, on the other hand, eliminates any basis for national independence, which would then form a needless economic impediment. An independent Catalonia under the present conditions means furthermore placing it under the protective rule of a strong imperialist power, whereby socialism there is obviously precluded. The cunning "Marxists" want to make use of the "national matter" for international purposes; which likewise is a practical impossibility, for the support of "national matters" is necessarily at the same time the prevention of the class struggle within the nation and thereby the strengthening of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements. National elements are counter-

revolutionary: that is a lesson which the spanish workers also will have to learn from experience, unless they turn their struggle against the bourgeoisie into a struggle also against the national nonsense.

The official, though at present powerless catalonian government of Companys and Casanovas is taking a quite passive attitude with respect to the workers by whom the power is exercised. This passivity is its resaue and preservation for later counter-revolutionary attacks. It is waiting for the first favorable opportunity to recover the lost powef. After the suppression of the fascist uprising in Barcelona, the real power was taken over by the workers' militia, in which the anarchists are the determining factor. Of course,this militia can govern only so long as it is able to prevent the development of new centers of power. The acts of the Companys government have shown with ali clarity that it regards the present state of affairs as only temporary, and in this hope it is confirmed by the attitude of the friendly powers. France and Russia continue to deal not with the workers,but with the discarded government. The struggle against fascism postpones the decisive struggle between bourgeoisie and proletariat and allows both sides only half-way measures which not only hold up the progress of the revolution, but also the forming of the counter-revolutionary forces; and both these factors are at the same time prejudicial to the anti-fascist struggle.In order to remain "representative" in the altered situation, the government has taken pains to include representatives of labor. But the socialists and stalinists taken into the government were forced out by the anarcho-syndicalists. The governmental decrees, which in part were in conformity with the demands of the situation as well as those of the workers, were necessary in order to keep this reserve government from vanishing out of the picture. Its continued existence shows that,altho the workers represent the actual power, still they do not dare as yet to put it to full use.

It is true that the workers obtained for themselves the 40 -hour week and a 15 percent wage increase, as well as the recognition of and extensive powers for the workers' councils in the enterprises; but still all this was for the present posited on the "cooperation of workers, enterprisers, trade unions and the government."Then the development passed on to "worker control" in the smaller enterprises and to the nationalization of the large ones. Four weeks after the suppression of the fascist uprising, the workers of Barcelona had taken over the railways,the municipal transport services (buses, trams, subway), the petroleum companies, the automobile industries,the steamship companies, the hospitals, the public services,(elec-

tricity, gas, water, etc.), the large stores, the building and contracting companies, the munition plants, the theaters and cinemas. Each enterprise is conducted by a workers' council which is responsible for production. As a transitional measure, these workers' councils are subordinated to a General Committee for the direction and control of all economic activity, which is made up of delegates of the various trade unions. A leveling up of wages is ordered. The salaries paid to directors in the concerns placed under control are to be reduced, and in the socialized enterprises the old boards of directors are to be completely suppressed. In preparation is the introduction of the 36-hour week, as well as publication of the financial situation of the concerns, together with a complete list of stock. Likewise, the setting up of a work program, particularly for the enterprises serving the military defense. To avoid international complications, foreign capital ownership has been left unmolested.

By the side of the production committee, another was formed to provide for subsistence. The rural syndicates of the C.N.T. and the collectives of the expropriated domains place foodstuffs at the disposal of the population. The C.N.T. syndicate for the workers in the foodstuffs branch has become the supply center of Barcelona. The distribution of the foodstuffs was in part effected by means of so-called bonds or tickets, whereby the bourgeoisie was automatically excluded. The circulation of money has, however, been maintained. In the further program of the revolution stands the design of going over to planned control of the economy in order to harmonize production and consumption. Also a state monopoly of foreign trade, nationalization of the banks and the complete collectivization of agriculture. So that we have here in the economic regard a condition and plans similar to those at the beginning of the russian revolution, and the slow transformation of private economy into state economy, interpenetrated with factors of so-called war communism. The measures adopted to date point rather in the direction of a state-capitalist than of a communist economy; even though this state-capitalist economy, in case it should come about, need not be a hundred-percent copy of the russian. Even though the turn to real communism, to the abolition of wage-labor and to direct control of all economic activity thru the workers is still not absolutely precluded, yet from the present transitional stage and the "partial socialization" we are rather justified in looking forward to an economy after the russian model, in case both possibilities are not eliminated thru a return to a fascist or democratic capitalism in which private property would be maintained under state coordination.

As yet the workers have nothing certain but the armed power. Since a communist society is possible only thru the continuance of the revolution, these workers will sooner or later have to resign their power to a special group, just as this power even today stands under the influence of the organizational interests of the C.N.T. and F.A.I. With the surrender of the power, the state capitalist perspective is probable, whereupon the bureaucracy necessary to it will be furnished either by the anarcho-syndicalist or the socialist-stalinist elements or by a combination of the two. If the spanish fascists win, they will then, unless this is prevented by the imperialist powers, slaughter the catalonian revolutionary movement with the aid of the catalonian bourgeoisie, to which greater concessions will be made on the part of Madrid. If the Madrid Government wins, it will then,--possibly after a period of pseudo-socialism sufficing to make "democracy" also strong in opposition to the workers--in conjunction with the catalonian bourgeoisie and the sympathetic part of the labor movement, likewise strike down the anarcho-syndicalist workers and set aside the social accomplishments won to date. It will perhaps be forced to take up the struggle against the workers forthwith.

There is a large number of possibilities. The spanish struggle alters the situation continuously. Surprises are not precluded. For the present, all that is possible in the way of anticipation is to take into consideration the various eventualities, for the thousand interlinking elements of the social conflicts are not clearly observable from this distance. The tasks of the proletariat, however, are clear. And clear also is the fact that the forces interested in the maintenance of capitalist exploitation society were in a position to hold up the full development of the struggle against fascism. Ostensibly is was desired, thru limitation of the struggle against the fascist form of State and its policy, to enlarge the anti-fascist front and secure its unity in order to aid in the victory of democracy as the lesser evil for the workers. In reality, this limitation leads to defeat. In this way the government was not in a position to bring into action against fascism the full weight of the mass of peasants because in order not to frighten away the bourgeois elements, it did not dare to award the peasants the complete expropriation of landed property, and because it did not dare to take up the complete expropriation of capital ownership for fear of losing the sympathies of the democratic powers as well as those of the petty bourgeois and of its own democratic bourgeoisie. The minimum program of the anti-fascists led so far that in the course of the struggle the fascist demagogy was

enabled to develop a program which was more radical than that of the popular-front government. The Chicago Tribune could permit itself the malicious pleasure of remarking that "the 'Reds' spoke like Fascists, and the Fascists like Bolsheviks."

What was intended to lend force to the anti-fascist struggle, weakened it. The workers can even now,when the fate of the spanish revolution still hangs in the balance, derive the lesson that the anti-fascist struggle is capable of winning only as a fight against capitalism; that it is only as such that it has meaning for the workers; that these latter are obliged, from the first day of the struggle against fascism onward,to attack also the capitalist property relations; that they can strengthen their own position only when,at the same time, they disrupt irrevocably the foundations of the capitalist order. It is false to believe that fascism was first to be struck down, after which the rest would come as a matter of course. The workers' struggle must be directed not exclusively against fascism,but against Capital in all its forms and manifestations. Even tho such a policy may bring the whole capitalist world into action against the revolution at once, yet it is only such a policy which is capable of arousing in word and in deed the solidarity of the world's working population.

War against a communist Spain would not be an ordinary war; it would be a war which, in certain circumstances, in view of the position of the working class,could become the international class war against the international bourgeoisie. It needs to be stated plainly that it is silly to believe that the democratic imperialism could rush to the aid of the spanish revolutionists. What would be needed is that the french workers should rush to the aid of the spanish revolutionists, but this at the same time would mean the revolution in France. And if the revolution fails to roll on in this manner, if it dies out, still its defeat is only a stage in the proletariat's revolutionary onward march. The workers cannot shout,with the mendacious rabble of the old labor movement, for arming of the spanish popular-front government at the hands of the democratic countries. Such arming takes place only so long as bourgeois society is sure of its mastery and it would direct these arms also against the revolutionary proletariat. The revolutionary proletariat in Spain precludes arming of the popular-front government at the hands of other bourgeoisies. The proletariat can only arm itself. It was the task of the international proletariat,--particularly of the french workers who have already shown themselves capable of occupying the minitions factories for so little as an increase in wages--to seize arms and

get them to Spain. But that would be not only the simultaneous revolution in France; it would also be the beginning of the imperialist war, which,however, would then pose the revolutionary question at its very beginning instead of leaving it in abeyance until the bloody end. The working population which failed to rusch to the aid of the spanish revolutionists,on its own initiative and against the will of its organizations,has betrayed the spanish revolution just as was done by the scurvy rabble of the two Internationals. And these workers, who were unwilling to risk their lives for their spanish comrades,will perhaps after all be shoved tomorrow onto the battlefield. If the spamish question should after all serve as the occasion for the outbreak of the war between the fascist and the "democratic" capitalisms,then the workers will be persuaded,ostensibly in order to aid the spanish anti-fascists,to fight on the side of their bourgeoisie against the enemy fascist bourgeoisie. It must be said plainly,however, that even then the workers are not coming to the aid of the spanish comrades,but of the imperialistic interests of their bourgeoisie.The bourgeoisie never takes up for working-class interests ;it may combat on fascism in favor of another,but it is never anti-fascist.What the workers of the world have to do in order to help help themselves and thereby also the spanish comrades is only one thing: to take up the struggle against their own bourgeoisie, and with the overthrow thereof to doom spanish fascism as well.

At the time when this article is brought to a close, the further course of the spanish civil war is still unforseeable. Regarded from the military point of view, the fascists seem to be gaining the upper hand,Toledo has fallen, the march upon Madrid continues.But this advance can still be held up:thru uprisings in the rear of the fascists, in spite of the terror which is being exercised,as well as thru a surprising shift in the situation on thefronts,thru a new exertion of effort by the workers.The anti-fascist front still has various possibilities. Altho it no longer controls more than a third of the country,nevertheless this portion contains important industrial centers which make it possible to continue the manufacture of arms and munitions. The problem of subsistence also is still for the present soluble. But the fascits too have adjusted everything, in the territory at their disposition, to the continuation of the war.They have ,moreover, the military aid of Italy and Germany. But even with the fall of Madrid the struggle is still not necessarily decided, tho the panicky sentiment arising from a series of defeats may also bring the

civil war to a quick end. This end would not diminish the sacrifices of the proletariat; the white terror of conquering fascism will far surpass all the previous bestialities. In view of this situation, the fighting workers will no doubt go all the way down the line. But even their defeat is powerless to affect the situation, which is objectively ripe for revolution. This defeat is also at the same time the beginning of a new series of workers' struggles which will stand out far in advance of everything hitherto accomplished and which even today, before the beginning of the world war and the beginning of the new world-revolutionary wave, point to itscolossal impetus. The victims of the spanish revolution are already the first victims of the approaching world revolution, nor could a present-day victory of spanish fascism suffice to conjure the fact away. The verve and the enthusiasm of the spanish revolutionists of today is a guarantee of the victory of the new workers' revolution tomorrow.

.....
.....
....

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

Work Shop Committees in England

On The Soviet Constitution

What Must Be Done?

MAX NOMAD'S "Masters of Tomorrow"

The "Popular Front" and Fascism

Vol. II **No. 12**

NOVEMBER 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

civil war to a quick end. This end would not diminish the sacrifices of the proletariat; the white terror of conquering fascism will far surpass all the previous bestialities. In view of this situation, the fighting workers will no doubt go all the way down the line. But even their defeat is powerless to affect the situation, which is objectively ripe for revolution. This defeat is also at the same time the beginning of a new series of workers' struggles which will stand out far in advance of everything hitherto accomplished and which even today, before the beginning of the world war and the beginning of the new world-revolutionary wave, point to itscolossal impetus. The victims of the spanish revolution are already the first victims of the approaching world revolution, nor could a present-day victory of spanish fascism suffice to conjure the fact away. The verve and the enthusiasm of the spanish revolutionists of today is a guarantee of the victory of the new workers' revolution tomorrow.

.....
.....
....

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE

For Theory and Discussion

CONTENTS:

Work Shop Committees in England

On The Soviet Constitution

What Must Be Done?

MAX NOMAD'S "Masters of Tomorrow"

The "Popular Front" and Fascism

Vol. II **No. 12**

NOVEMBER 1936

$1.00 YEARLY **10c A COPY**

INTERNATIONAL

COUNCIL

CORRESPONDENCE

.·. Published at 1237 North California Avenue, Chicago, Illinois .·.

By the Groups of Council Communists of America

The period of progressive capitalist development is historically closed. The decline period of capital, a permanent condition of crisis, compels to ever greater convulsions of economy, to new imperialistic and military conflicts, to ever increasing unemployment and to general and absolute impoverishment of the workers. Thus is given the objective situation for the communist revolution in the capitalist countries. For the working class, there is only the revolutionary way out, which leads to the communist society. No one can deprive the workers of this task, which must be carried out by the class itself.

The publishers of Council Correspondence see in the acting self-initiative of the workers and in the growth of their self-consciousness the essential advance of the labor movement. We therefore combat the leadership policy of the old labor movement, and call upon the workers to take their fate in their own hands, to set aside the capitalist mode of production and themselves to administer and direct production and distribution in accordance with social rules having universal validity. As a fighting slogan and statement of goal we propose:

All power to the workers' councils! The means of production in the hands of the Workers!

WORK SHOP COMMITTEES IN ENGLAND

Although to a certain extent and within limits, British capitalism is predominant in determining the policies of European countries, and in assisting to precipitate a crisis, nevertheless British capitalism receives in return its own repercussions; although, at the moment, not of the same or similar severity, still it contains within its own national boundaries the contradiction of national and international capitalism.

The crisis now moves from one country to another with such rapidity that English gentlemen of avowed bourgeois democratic principles stand aghast and view with apprehension any economic movement by the workers. The stay-in strike of a very small section of the Civil servants, hardly noticeable and given no prominence by the press, raised the budget magician, Neville Chamberlain, to warn not only these workers, but also his Government of the striking significance of this behavior. "This kind of activity must be suppressed," says the Chancellor. "it is undemocratic; it is unconstitutional; it is a violation of Trade Unionism; it is unworthy of the British working man." And the chorus is reiterated by the Government, the Labor Party, the Trade Union leaders and the Communist Party. The latter, along with the rest of Social Democracy, have denounced all unofficial strikes, and they insist upon the workers bearing the

yoke of Trade Unionism, which binds the workers hand and foot to capitalism.

The British workers, who are now recovering from the terrific onslaughts made upon their standards of living (with the assistance of the last Labor government) are in constant battle with the old forms of organization. Out of the shell of Trade Unions, by way of spontaneous strikes, the workers are creating new weapons of revolt, in some cases successfully. The kicking-over of the traces, forming workshop committees and negotiating from the floor of the workshop, denote the changing from quantity to quality. The efforts of the Trade Union leaders, the prosecutions and mass fines imposed upon the workers, have had no effect. This year has witnessed more strikes in Britain, particularly in the midlands, than in any previous year in its history. The miners as usual are leading the way, followed by the textile and clothing workers; and in all cases, either by strike or threat of strike, concessions have been granted. It remains to be seen whether these sops will hold the workers in check.

This winter will witness many demonstrations, protests (which have already commenced), and revolts by the unemployed who, by the way, are the only section of the working class who are to-receive a reduction in their already miserable allowance. The National Government's attack upon the unemployed, to commence in November, is bound to produce hostility thruout the country, owing to its policy of re-armament, subsidizing the shipowners, the farmers, and the sugar beet industry, foreign investments, including ten million in Soviet Russia, and granting concessions to all classes of employed workers who have the courage to demand increased standards of living.

The Government may or may not withdraw their intended attack upon the unemployed, who now number 3,600,000 registered, who are divided into two groups, 1,800,000 on Unemployment Benefit, and a similar number on Out-of-work relief. This does not include the thousands who are outside the scheme of relief owing to the Means Test. Marches of the unemployed are already in the process of formation, and of course these hunger marches can be of no assistance, as the marchers are still hungry after their return from London.

In case the belly crawlers, the come-soonists have any doubts as to their support of Trade Unions, we will quote from the pamphlet Communist Party and Affiliation to the Labor Party, 1936: "We have never been in opposition to the Trade Unions. We have always believed that the Trade Unions were essential for the industrial

struggles of the workers. Many of our members have extremely fine Trade Union records, and have recruited large numbers to the Unions. We do not want unofficial strikes. We are not splitters of the Trade Union movement - but builders of it. It is obligatory upon our membership that they be Trade Unionists wherever possible. We have always stood upon the principle of a strong, a democratic Trade Union movement being a key part of the workers power against capitalism."

To prove how reactionary these jumping jacks of the Comintern are, we must here state that there are 1,120 Trade Unions in Britain, and while there were in 1926 at the time of the general strike 8,000,000 trade unionists, in 1936 its membership has fallen to 4,500,000. Some sections have set up their own unions independent of the T.U.C. and general labor fakirism.

The new forms of organization contain the germs of Soviets, and a consciousness on an altogether higher plane than the orthodox Trade Unions; but then this development of consciousness by the workers themselves, due to working in more highly developed industries, conflicts with the Leninist dictum that consciousness can only be imparted from without, or by the party. Hence the Communist Party's opposition to this new progressive form of organization.

The Communist Party also states that "we believe that our active methods of fighting the employing class are in the interests of the working class, and are in fact the only way of rousing the workers to such a pitch that the Labor Party can gain victory on the electoral field. Therefore, while our methods are different in some respects to the Labor Party, they are supplementary, not opposed to it."Obviously not opposed to the policy of the Lord Snowden's, the Sir Walter's, the Sir Ben's, etc. This in the name of Communism, and in the name of a working class party as though the working class had knighted these gentlemen. We have here also an admittance that the C.P. desire another Labor Party government, which government ruthlessly cut the wages of all civil servants and introduced the vilest, most despicable piece of legislation that has ever confronted the working class in Britain, the Means Test. The working class suffered its greatest suppression during the Labor Party regime. This, of course, is to be expected as long as the State apparatus exists, no matter which Party rules the roost.

- Leeds, England. -

ON THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION

The following open letter to Feuchtwanger is taken from the Sozialistische Warte of Aug. 15, 1936.

Dear Mr. Feuchtwanger:

Only yesterday I read your article on the new Soviet constitution in the Deutsche Zentral Zeitung (Moscow) of July 2. Simultaneously I received another paper, the "Rote Fahne" (Prague) of July 22. In the latter is confirmed what until now had been officially denied: namely, that Zenzi Muhsam, widow of Erich Muhsam, who had sought asylum in the U.S.S.R., had been arrested and faces deportation because of "Trotzkyist activities". A close connection exists between these two matters, for, in your article in the Deutsche Zentral Zeitung, you praise the new Soviet constitution as a document of real democracy, thus marking the Soviet Union as the land of that freedom which is so ardently desired by every progressive human.

I do not know whether (and how long) you were in the U.S.S.R., or from what sources your knowledge of Soviet conditions is derived. But I was painfully struck by the fact that the author of "Success", the "Brothers Oppenheim" and the "Josephus", who in all his works demonstrates such a high degree of historical exactitude, a critical faculty, an unrelenting search for truth, a conscientious search for unassailable data, here deserts these methods and allows himself to be deceived.

You write that "the constitution of the Soviet Union for the first time in the history of mankind established actual freedom and equality of the citizens as its fundamental law".

For three years I have lived in the Soviet Union, worked in responsible posts of the Soviet apparatus. Since my return to the West, my connections with the U.S.S.R. have not been discontinued. In addition, I carefully read the Soviet press and all the important Soviet literature. On the basis of my observations, as

well as from official Soviet material, I must tell you what long has ceased being a secret! Inequality in the Soviet Union surpasses by far the differentiation in many bourgeois countries. Common workers, nurses, scrub-women, streetcar conductors, small employees, in short, a group embracing millions receives a monthly income of from 80 to 150 rubles. A red marshal, a leading party official, a chief engineer, a "red director", a theatre or movie star, a successful journalist or author such as Radek, Kolzow, Scholochow or Feolin, receive between 5,000 and 20,000 rubles monthly, sometimes even more. In the same machine shop a Stakhanovite workman will receive 1,000 to 2,000 rubles monthly, while his co-worker whose physical and technical faculties prevent him from attaining record production receives from 120 to 160 rubles per month. Here especially the conditions you describe as characteristic of bourgeois democracy prevails: "that one-tenth of the renters occupy nine-tenths of the dwelling space, while the remaining nine-tenths occupy one-tenth of the available space. This is true literally as well as figuratively.

In the Soviet cities the masses occupy an average dwelling space of 5.2 square meters per capita (!) (Izwestia, May 30, 1936). But the upper strata has large dwellings, rented for life, or villas have been provided for their use. They ride in Lincolns, play in luxurious amusement places with jazz and champagne. Their women wear Paris gowns, silver fox furs and platinum jewelry. Visit the Metropole, National Grand Hotel, or Savoy in Moscow, or the Europa or Astoria in Leningrad after midnight; - then ride out into the outskirts that even today have no water systems. Visit the barracks of the subway workers, the lumber workers, the street workers and peat cutters. Do not eat in the model restaurants of the Stakhanovites, but go into the kitchens of some unknown plant.

It would be a tragic mistake to believe in the possibility of betterment of this mass as a whole. The number of those who can climb into the upper group that is constantly consolidating itself into a tightly restricted upper caste is becoming ever smaller. This upper caste is becoming the real beneficiary of the state control of the means of production. They swallow the surplus value produced by the masses. The masses receive none of it.

So for, the "equality" in material things. Much more important is the question of civil and political equality. You hail the freedom of thought, press and assembly, announced in the new constitution, as a fundamental achievement. The deprivation of these

rights till now, according to your statement, has been the basis of sneering reflections on the citizens of Soviet Russia. This passage struck me most painfully. For it proved that you support the new constitution without knowing the old. The old constitution contained the same provisions! But the old provisions were "window-dressing", just as the new ones must be.

Article 141 of the new draft says essentially that only the Communist Party (the other "social organizations" mentioned are only subdivisions of it) has the right to run candidates. This is as it has been. There can be no change on this basis. But the party is not the membership. The "party" has been for years the Polit-bureau of ten. This controls the press, the radio, the publications, all of "public opinion". Despite all constitutional rights, it is impossible for an uncensored line, an uncensored word to appear without danger.

Now, as before, the following laws prevail in the Soviet Union:

1. The law on "treason" (1934), that not only fixes the death penalty for flight out of the country, but provides for the internment in concentration camps for the relatives of the refugee, including his underage children.

2. The "Kirov-law" of July 12,1934. Secret trials against political offenders, in the absence of the accused, without possibility of defense, revision or pardon. ("D.Z.Z.", Aug.12,1934).

3. The law of July 4, 1935, extending the death penalty to children twelve years old or over. ("D.Z.Z. Aug.4,1935).

Now as before, concentration camps exist in the Soviet Union: in Karelia; on the Solovetski islands in the arctic circle; in Siberia; in Turkestan. There, in the lumber camps, railroad and canal building camps, ..in swamp reclamation projects, millions are working in a murderous climate under the most primitive hygienic conditions and with deplorable rations.

Now as before, besides exiled kulaks, priests and criminals, these camps include thousands of Social Democrats, Social-Revolutionaries and opposition Communists, - men who support the principles of socialism, whose sole "crime" consists of disagreement with the Stalin line; men who took the phrase "freedom of speech", guaranteed in the constitution, seriously. Numberless witnesses testify to these conditions; the

Yugoslav Communist Ciliga and his comrades, who for years were dragged from one concentration camp to another; the conscience-stricken G.P.U. commander of the Solovetski islands; Kisselev who wrote the "Camps of Death" after fleeing from Russia; the Czech Communist Josef Pirkou who gives irrefutable testimony of his internment in the Baikal-Amur camp in Siberia; Rudolph Phillip who in his "Max Hoelz, the last German Revolutionist" (Reso-Publishing House, Zurich) paints a picture of the terrible corruption of the upper strata; the former American Communist A.Smith who wrote the book "I was a Soviet Worker" (E. P. Dutton, N.Y.); The French-Russian author Victor Serge who in "Our Word" (Paris) appealed to Andre Gide; the five Austrian Schutzbund members who, in behalf of 200 disillusioned comrades, returned from Soviet Russia, wrote "Twice in Flight" (Labor Press, Vienna); Erich Wollenberg, red army commander in Bavaria, 1919, and many, many others I could name.

Many overlook the shortcomings of the U.S.S.R.because they sincerely believe that the Soviet Union, despite all this, is still a force for freedom and progress. But anyone who does not wish to deceive himself, and realizes that the recognition of truth is the first condition of real progress must reject for himself and all others any policy of illusion, - hard as this may be.

A country as powerfully fortified as the U.S.S.R. of today has no need of this terror for its maintenance. Terror here has become an end in itself - reasons of state that are a cruel mockery to the paper ideals of the constitution.

There remains the last fiction: the U.S.S.R. as an anti-fascist power. Here the statistics of the League of Nations remark: "During the sanctions period, the U.S.S.R. was the only participating state that, instead of decreasing, increased its exports to Italy by 10 percent." Further: official German and Soviet sources report that in 1935 the U.S.S.R. delivered to Germany 226,000 tons of manganese, the most important raw material for the armament industry - 52 percent of the total German manganese import.

Soviet exports to Italy mean oil. Soviet Oil propelled Italian battleships to the Suez Canal. Soviet benzine was in the tanks of the airships that bombed Abyssinian hospitals. That was yesterday! Tomorrow, murder instruments produced by Krupp with Soviet manganese can submerge the world in death and destruction.

A terrible guilt rests upon all who know of these

things -- and keep quiet. When this man is Feuchtwanger, the guilt is even greater.

- A. Rudolf -

(Former Soviet official. Author of "Goodbye to Russia".)

- - - -

development. The trend towards fascistic methods -- politically and economically -- proves that in order to reorganize society it is insufficient to merely change the government; that is, to replace the old government with a better one: instead of bourgeois-liberal, fascistic, socialistic or bolshevist government. Though such a reorganization changes the outer face of society, it does not alter the essence of capitalist society. The Soviet-Russian example, for instance, shows that the socialist-bolshevist form of government keeps the wage system intact. Soviet Russia advocates a more justified distribution of the wealth of the nation by paying so-called higher socialist wages. The fact remains, however, that as long as wages exist, the capitalist relationship exists. Wages and capital are two sides of one and the same thing: one is unthinkable without the other.

The result of the old labor-movement policy was, and still is, - if successful - a revolution from above. From the government buildings wave socialist flags, but the masses are not permitted to form the character of the new society. As the wage system continues as the economic basis, all premises for capitalist exploitation remain. The abolishing of private property in the means of production alone has nothing to do with communism.

In order to initiate classless society, it is necessary that the masses themselves influence the development of the Communist revolution. The emancipation of the proletariat depends upon its self-initiative to carry out all arising problems; they will have to do everything themselves and nobody can or must be permitted to relieve them of that task. We must realize that it is no longer possible for small conscientious minorities to lead an indifferent mass toward the revolution. The revolution which the proletariat now faces aims to change completely the fundamentals of society, and this act can be accomplished only by direct participation of the masses. The proletariat must learn during its struggles to execute power in the interest of its class. There is no other means but the actual struggle which will teach the masses that self-initiative is the requisite for a successful social revolution. It must learn to disregard all party and union leadership and to place all responsibility upon their own workers' councils. All other ways lead back to bourgeois revolution and to capitalism.

In order that the struggle of the workers may lead to a complete reorganization of society, clarity of the new economic form is of utmost importance. The first

act of the new society must be the abolishing of wage labor and the finding of the correct relation between producer and the means of production. Upon the solution of these tasks depends the content and development of the social revolution. With the abolishing of money and wage-labor, exploitation ceases to exist. Success in this direction can be assured only if the workers control all means of production and distribution, and by not permitting the development of a new bureaucracy which might want to rule the workers "in the interest of a fair distribution of the products."

The fundamental basis of capitalism is wage labor. Wage labor presupposes a division of society into producers and means of production. On account of this relationship, the workers are condemned to life-long wage slavery which makes possible the production of surplus value (profit) and accelerates periodical crises. The wage system is the main contradiction of capitalist society out of which all economic difficulties arise.

The enormous development of the productive forces, the boundless expansion of production have increased the capitalist contradictions immensely. The international crisis of the profit system on the one hand throws the proletariat into a stage of starvation; but on the other hand, it is the motor towards a state capitalist reorganization of bourgeois society. With the aid of state subventions, the objective of capital -- the production of surplus value -- shall be obtained. The intervention of the state in the productive process (planned economy) may limit the economic freedom of the bourgeoisie, yet it does not alter the basic principles of the system as a whole. Even the acquisition by the state, as we find it for instance in Soviet Russia, does not abolish the capitalist relationship between the means of production and human labor power realized in wages. Also under state capitalism accumulation of commodities, and with it the wielding of power of the product over the producers, continues to exist. The only difference lies in this: in place of the superfluous bourgeois class, the state has become the exploiter. The economic programs of the social democratic and bolshevist parties are all based upon state-capitalistic conceptions. They therefore are based upon the capitalistic mode of production and are merely a continuation of wage slavery.

The main object of the proletarian revolution is the overthrow of capitalism; that is, the abolition of the wage system. This can be accomplished only thru a political struggle which, however, must not lead to a new form of 'state-socialistic' oppression of

the working class. During the revolution, the main task is to bring about a relationship between the workers and the social product which makes impossible the formation of a new ruling class. In his socio-economic studies, especially on the experiences of the Paris Commune, Karl Marx came to the conclusion that the organization of the communistic society must be based upon the association of free and equal producers. This association has nothing in common with idealistic plans of the socialistic world reformers. On the contrary, it has a very sober materialistic basis. Its foundation is the social average labor time; that is, the computation of the time necessary to make a product. Marx and Engels very clearly showed the possibility to use the working hour as a unit of reckoning for the productive process.

Only the co-operative ownership of the means of production upon this revolutionary basis leads to the abolition of the capitalist commodity production and of wage slavery. Wherever this relationship is not applied, a new form of exploitation must of necessity develop. The conditions in the Soviet Union furnish a classical example in this respect. The Russian proletariat seems to be the owner of the means of production; actually, however, the executive power over them rests in the hands of the Supreme Economic Council. Not the producers, in accordance with their labor time spent, determine their part of the product, but the Central Executive and its industry directors. The result of such a policy leads to a continuation of the old struggle for influential positions, as centralized economic power is equal to political power, and whoever rules the state rules also over the national product and assigns its distribution. Therewith remains the capitalist contradiction between society and state, between producer and government. The producer is depending upon the government official who -- based upon 'statistics' -- assigns his part. The worker remains a wage laborer. The difference between state socialism and association is in reality the difference between capitalism and communism.

Precisely for this reason there is no room left in the communist association for a ruling power over the producers. Not the state manages the administration of production and distribution, but these functions will be performed jointly by the consumers and producers. While the reformist theory of the socialization or nationalization of industries only means a continuation of capitalist concentration, to the Marxian conception the socialization of the economic system as a whole is already ripe for communism. It

should be evident that the revolutionary initiative in all factories and shops should be developed so that the proletarians themselves will erect the communist system of production. This is a process which can only be performed from the bottom up by the producers themselves. This revolutionizing economic development cannot be accomplished by any legitimate steps from above. By introducing the factor of working hours as general basis for the process of production, the economic power does actually get into the hands of the working class. The relation of the producer to the products of society is based in itself, and the individual's share of the product is determined by the actual production itself. The complete process of production is thus based on a sound foundation and the masses themselves manage and plan their own economic problems. A bureaucratic system to control prices and distribution is therefore irrevocably obsolescent. That means the conditions are given for the state to vanish as the interference by the state as a powerful factor in the economic conditions has become superfluous. The monetary system will be replaced by a form which uses the socially necessary labor-time as a unit of reckoning.

The distribution of consumer's goods presupposes, of course, the impossibility of giving to the producers the full equivalent of their labor time. The production process uses, or consumes, not only labor power but also machines, raw materials, etc. Beside these fundamental requirements for the smooth continuation of the process, society must provide means which make possible the development of "unproductive enterprises" which merely serve scientific and cultural interests, The producers, therefore, will not receive the full equivalent of their labor time, but these deductions are an economic necessity. The intensity of accumulation, however, must be determined by the producers themselves in order to avoid the development of too great a difference between social accumulation and social consumption, as such a difference would lead to disturbances and crises. Reproduction and accumulation on a communist basis are functions which can be controlled by the producers by simple bookkeeping and by direct executive power over the funds accumulated. The bookkeeping is so simple that any worker who is able to read and write could do it. No trained specialists are needed.

These are in general the principles of the communist mode of production. They are applicable to industry and to agriculture. The economic dictatorship of the communist association dismisses all rights of exploitation and expels every one who does not accept this

law. But since the producers themselves run industry, they build the fundamentals for a development which eventually will make the dictatorship superfluous. Upon the basis of association, the proletarian dictatorship is merely a transformation to classless society. As communist society initiates a planned system of production in accordance with the collective wants of society as a whole, the capitalist mode of expropriation will be replaced by a system in which production is carried on in the interest of all members of society, thereby ending the struggle for individual supremacy -- society ceases to be divided into exploited and exploiting classes.

- :::::::

MAX NOMAD'S "MASTERS OF TOMORROW"

Max Nomad's answer (#) to our article "Dictatorship of the Intellectuals?" (C.C., No. 7) gives us occasion to take up the theme once more. All considered, however, there is not much additional that needs to be said;now as before, the two conceptions stand fundamentally opposed. The space still available to us in this debate is to be used merely for refuting a few objections which seem to us unjustified and for clearing up various points which appear to have been left obscure.

Nomad objects to our borrowing the phrase about the "dictatorship of the traveling salesmen" (16) from a certain Jerome, a salaried employee of the C.P. We are not interested in Jerome or his connections; and while this particular statement of his appeared to us to hit the mark, we by no means identify ourselves with its author, any more than we identify ourselves with Nomad when we quote him with approval. The excitement about Jerome we leave confidently to Nomad himself, who no doubt characterizes this fellow correctly. To us, <u>all</u> the present functionaries and "leaders" of the old labor movement are in the last analysis "Jeromes", with whom we have nothing to do but with whom we are often obliged, nevertheless, to concern ourselves.Since these fellows do a lot of talking, they also frequently say something that strikes us as accurate; and in such a case it appears that Nomad also is not averse to turning the thing to account. For example, in his argument against us (27), he appeals to K.A.Wittfogel,who likewise is of the camp of the Third International, and to Heinz Neumann, a salaried subject of the C.P. and one of the lowest scoundrels with which the labor movement has ever been burdened. Nomad may still explain to us why he himself is to be permitted to "borrow from a source from which ordinary prudence should have told <u>us</u> to keep away". (16)

Nomad wishes (16) to "protest specifically against one particular instance of our polemic methods,dealing not with matters of opinion or interpretation but with actual facts." "P.M.", he says, "declares as 'groundless' the 'whole story' that Bismarck in pursuance of his state socialist (or state capitalist) plans,had solicited

---

(#) "The Masters of Tomorrow",Council Correspondence, Sept.1936, to which, unless otherwise states, all page numbers (in parentheses) refer.

the support of Marx and of his closest associates. In the first place, I did not claim, as P.M. seems to insinuate, that this was 'a proof of the compatibility of Marxism with state capitalism'. In an article dealing with State Socialism and State Capitalism, this was adduced as evidence of Bismarck's state socialist tendencies. In the second place, my 'groundless' assertion is based upon a full-length story by Wilhelm Liebknecht, one of Marx's closest associates, told in his Kein Kompromiss, kein Wahlbundnis (page 8) which, in condensed form, I had presented in my Marx biography published in Scribner's, March 1933, page 190."

In Scribner's, for June 1934, page 409, Nomad wrote: "At the close of the sixties, Bismarck played with the idea of nationalizing all branches of Germany's economic life. To carry out that plan, he even solicited the collaboration of Marx and his closest associates." On page 410, Nomad continues: "The reason for the German Socialist's opposition to the State Socialism (i.e. State Capitalism) of the Prussian Junkers was obvious. Under the political overlordship of the Hugenbergs and Von Papens of those years, all the power, all the more privileged positions in the government, in the administration of the Nation's economic and political life, would go to the educated scions of the Junkers and the upper middle classes, while the educated lower middle classes, from which most of the Socialist leadership issued, would be reduced to the role of mere subalterns with salaries of low-paid white-collar slaves. That is why in his time, Karl Marx, as a revolutionary democrat, disregarded Bismarck's offer, and why the Socialists, as a general rule, have not been enthusiastic about the nationalization of individual branches of industry in those countries which lacked democratic institutions." (Emphasis ours.)

To which we replied in C.C. #7, page 21: "Nomad mentions the state-capitalist plans of Bismarck and states that Bismarck sought to assure himself of Marx's aid in the matter. But this can hardly be alleged as proof of the compatibility of Marxism with state capitalism, even supposing that Bismarck had actually entered into such relations with Marx. As a matter of fact, the whole story is groundless; Bismarck never turned to Marx in this connection, but conducted an inconsequential correspondence with Lasalle, whose opportunism, as is well known always met with Marx's severest condemnation."

Any unprejudiced reader on comparing these two quotations can see for himself that Nomad's protestation is in vain. His entire article in Scribner's is concerned with pointing out that the marxist as well as the fascist movement is driving to state capitalism; every

example of which he there makes use serves to support this thesis, hence also the alleged intermezzo between Marx and Bismarck. Since he furthermore presents the reason by which Marx was led to reject Bismarck's offer namely, because these was not enough in it for the socialist intellectuals, nothing further is needed to demonstrate that Nomad sees here also the compatibility of Marxism with state capitalism. For Marx rejected the offer, according to Nomad, solely and exclusively because the reward was too slight; from which the only natural inference is that there would possibly have been no refusal if Bismarck had offered more than . . . "salaries of low-paid white-collar slaves."

Nomad appeals to the authority of W.Liebknecht in order to show that his story in Scribner's was not 'groundless'. He appeals, that is, to the authority of a man of whom he himself has said: "For though he had been in personal touch with Marx . . . what is usually called 'scientific socialism' had always remained the deepest secret to him. A master of ultra-revolutionary oratory today, and of ultra-moderate and opportunist journalism tomorrow, and at bottom nothing but a radical democrat. For the father of the immortal German rebel of 1918 lacked both tact and consistency, and his only redeeming feature was his dog-like devotion to Marx, even tho the latter treated him like a dog". ("Johann Most", Modern Monthly, July 1936, page 15.) It is upon a propaganda pamphlet of this man, who, like Nomad, had a special predilection for trumpeting the state capitalist plans of Bismarck, for making mysterious plots out of the capitalistic "labor policy" of the time and for "showing up" the "duplicity" of the government in an equally "duplicitous" and mysterious manner,--it is upon the chatter of this man that Nomad tries to support his assertions in Scribner's. It is true that Liebknecht has frequently related (e.g., apart from the passages drawn upon by Nomad, also in the Leipzig trial for high treason in 1872, that the prussian government and the prussian junkers had made the most persistent attempts to induce him to exploit the labor movement in their own interest, and that after he had become certain of the matter, he had "broken off all connections with the agents and hired writers of Herr Bismarck"; but these unproved, exaggerated and frequently also well-founded turns of speech on the part of Liebknecht (for no doubt at that time, just as today, attempts were made to secure the labor leaders for political purposes) can by no means be used to construe the possibility of a connection between Bismarck and Marx.

In reality, the "state-capitalist" plans of Bismarck consisted in nothing more than various political manoeuvers for securing the interests of the government,which

never had any intention of serving more than Germany's upswing along the path of private economy. We have already, in our article in C. C. #7, mentioned the reasons for the appearance of "state-capitalist" tendencies in otherwise "normal" capitalist countries. In Germany, the death of capital and the struggle between aspiring capital and large landed property--a struggle which was later bridged over by way of compromises and Germany's development into an imperialist power--had brought forth, by the side of many other political shufflings and manoeuvers, also the peculiar "labor policy" of Bismarck and the combination with Lassalle in the winter of 1863-64, and thereby a political atmosphere in which the entire working population frequently felt that it was the government's darling. Lassalle was ready to support the Bismarck government in exchange for direct and universal suffrage. The "apostle of class harmony", as he was called by J. Knief, hoped then to secure for himself a position in Parliament by means of which the situation of the workers was ostensibly to be improved. Hence his readiness to operate with the feudal reaction against Capital, his striving for the "social kingship" and a sort of Hitler-role for himself. Bismarck, however, turned down the proposition of introducing direct and universal suffrage and other concessions, such as workers' cooperatives with financial aid of the State. All that had nothing to do with Marx and Marxism, a fact which even Nomad recognizes at another place.

Thus he writes in his biography of Most (Modern Monthly, June 1936, page 19): "With all his deadly criticism of capitalist profit-making, the author of Capital would have never considered the idea of allying himself with the feudal past as against the bourgeois present. But Lassalle, in order to further his own political ambitions, was flirting with Bismarck, and was ready to lend the Junkers the support of the working masses as against the Progressive Party, which represented the interest of the upper middle class". (#)

(#) It is interesting to note that in Nomad's article in Scribner's, the socialist leadership was not to be had for Bismarck's plans ostensibly because in the state capitalism conceived by Bismarck all the good positions "would go to the educated scions of the Junkers, and the upper middle classes"; while in Nomad's biography of John Most, Lassalle wants to proceed with Bismarck against the "upper middle class." Now if Bismarck's state capitalism was directed against the "upper middle class", how can Marx and associates then occupy an unfavorable position toward Bismarck's plans on the ground that their carrying out would have brought all the good positions to the elements of the "upper middle classes"?

Marx "would have never considered" because, as we learned from Nomad previously, he was not content "with salaries of low-paid white-collar slaves." Lassalle, on the contrary, seemed to be more modest?

We have been compelled to take up Nomad's "protest" in order to show that we are by no means interested, merely in order to win an argument, in twisting ideas or contesting facts. But after all, like the protest itself, so also our answer to it is so much wasted exertion; for regardless of whether Marx and Bismarck negotiated, wished to negotiate or were on the point of negotiating, or whether Bismarck asked or did not ask, whether Marx answered or failed to answer,--regardless of all that, we are sure that to Nomad state capitalism, or state socialism, remains identical with Marxism. Or doesn't it?

We are glad to take note that Nomad has used the term intellectual to apply exclusively to "the vast crowd of educated or semi-educated people that may or may not have a college degree, but can make a livelihood without resorting to manual or lower clerical labor." (17). And since at the same time it is essentially only the "outs", not the "ins", whom Nomad regards as having the state-capitalist ambitions, his preliminary material for the "Masters of Tomorrow" is limited to those intellectuals who are out of work or poorly paid. This infinitesimal minority of intellectuals, notwithstanding the fact that all the social instruments of power are in the hands of Capital and of the contented "ins", succeeds in certain favorable situations in getting the masses behind it, in throwing out the capitalists and changing places with the "ins". Whereupon the "ins" temporarily (as in Russia) become "outs",and it is not until after the social wealth begins to increase and the possibility arises of conferring advantages upon all the intellectuals that the "outs" again become linked to the exploiting state apparatus. Thus Nomad summarizes his theory. Such, it appears, is the gist of Nomad's theory. And so it is not the practicing,but the jobless or poorly paid intellectuals who are the champions of state socialism; they are such, then, not by reason of the fact that they are intellectuals, but because of their economic condition. Hence it is not essentially their intellectual function, which is either not exercised or poorly rewarded, but their political attitude and their gift of persuasion by which the masses are deluded, which forms the secret of their coming power. This is the conception which Nomad opposes to the marxist doctrine of class struggle. And while, moreover, in view of the great amount of unemployment among the workers, he casts doubt upon their capacity for self-rule based on control of the

enterprises, the rule of the intellectuals depends precisely upon the unemployment and poverty existing among them. We shall come back to this point in the further course of these remarks. For the present, we might merely state that after this clarification of his intellectualist concept, Nomad's theory strikes us as still more fantastic than before.

Nomad tries to demonstrate the existence of a contradiction in our position on the russian bureaucracy and the problem of the intellectuals. "On page 27", he writes (19), "the bureaucrats are (to P.M.) the 'capitalists', and on page 17 they are the 'intellectuals'." To us, the russian state bureaucracy rates as a total capitalist. As a state bureaucracy, not as a group of intellectuals, it rules society and thus lives off society. We have not contested, but emphasized, that a large part of the intellectuals and of the intellectualized workers belongs to this bureaucracy. On page 17 we said: "The struggle of the workers against the intellectuals could practically be only a struggle against the labor bureaucracy or, as today in Russia, a struggle against a state bureaucracy. The struggle against the intellectuals in private-capitalist countries has meaning only so long as there is reformist activity and reformist organization....It is not until and unless a state-capitalist revolution has been successful, it is only then that the struggle against the bureaucracy and hence against the intellectuals is taken up again...." And on page 27: "The special group of people which has the sole right of disposal over production is not the intellectuals but the state bureaucracy, which of course also embraces intellectuals "

Since the labor bureaucracy, and later the state bureaucracy, consists in large part, or exclusively if preferred, of intellectuals, if the working class turns against the bureaucracy, its struggle is necessarily directed also against the intellectuals. But it does not combat the intellectuals just because they are intellectuals, any more than it combats stamp-collecting or art-loving capitalists as stamp collectors or art fanciers, but in both cases because they are exploiters. Intellectuals, however, cannot be exploiters unless they have control of the means of production. The working class cannot take a hostile position to the socially necessary intellectual professions brought into existence thru the social division of labor, but only to a deceitful labor bureaucracy or to an exploiting state apparatus, regardless of the social stratum there dominant. Of course it is possible to throw rotten eggs at a bad tenor belonging to Nomad's intellectuals, but to mobilize the working class against him is surely something too much of a good thing. It would likewise be

possible to attack the intellectual Nomad on the ground that he consumes bread which he himself has not baked and thus contributes to consuming the surplus value created by the workers; but that too would surely be carrying matters too far. Intellectuals are not capable of exploiting the workers merely because they are intellectuals. But: once they are in control of organizations, they can deceive the workers; and if they have at their disposal the means of production, they can exploit the workers. We repeat: insofar as the workers combat intellectuals, it can only be a struggle against the labor or state bureaucracy.

Our "very ingenuous argument", as Nomad writes (18), by which the russian "intellectuals" are divided into intellectuals as such and into the state bureaucracy, so that the bureaucracy exploits that part of the intellectuals not belonging to it just as it does the workers--hence the fact that in this case we too, like Nomad himself, speak of "ins" and "outs",--we are surprised to find that Nomad, whose whole theory is based on this twofold division of the intellectuals, now rejects it as improper. Insofar as concerns Russia, Nomad regards all the intellectuals as taking part in the exploitation of the workers, even though the shares of the booty turn out to be different in the different cases and the struggle for altering this relation still goes on. Nomad insists on the permanent revolution, that is, on the continuous struggle between the "ins" and "outs". Well, then, he will have to admit that the success of the struggle between the "ins" and "outs" depends on a further factor. Why is it that the one group can draw more than the other? What are they fighting about? There is no doubt that they are fighting for positions of power, which are decisive in the distribution of the loot. Hence one group must have positions of power which the other does not. Hence the positions of power are not controlled by all the intellectuals, semi-intellectuals and ex-workers, but only by a part of them. With the denial of this fact, Nomad's whole theory of the permanent struggle between the "ins" and "outs" collapses. With the acceptance of this fact, there likewise collapses the theory that all intellectuals are at the same time the exploiters. Nomad has thought himself into a blind alley. The plain fact is that the "ins" as a state bureaucracy control production and distribution; that is the source of their predominance with respect to the "outs". These latter are confronted by the "ins" as master of the means of production, as capitalists, altho both the "ins" and the "outs" are here intellectuals.

With the aid of the dictionary and taking his stand on a russian phrase, Nomad regards all the intellectuals

in Russia as state employees forming a part of the bureaucracy. We are not concerned either with the dictionary or with the russian phrase, but only with reality, and we are still waiting for Nomad to demonstrate that "the intellectuals as a whole, forming the state bureaucracy, are the masters of the country". (20) If anyone were to say, with the russian bureaucrats themselves, that the state capitalism in Russia has put an end to the exploitation of the russian workers, Nomad would certainly give vent to all his scorn of such naivete. When the Bolsheviks assert, however, just as Hitler does of his National Socialism, that every laboring person in Russia is a part of the State and participates in the government, then Nomad accepts of this swindle exactly so much as he needs for his private theory and restricts his scorn to the part left over. He writes (19): "In Russia, where every branch of the country's economic and cultural life is managed by the Government, every man who is not a peasant or manual worker is a government office-holder, a member of the bureaucracy." As a matter of fact, the manual workers and peasants belong just as much (or just as little)to the state bureaucracy as does the great majority of the intellectuals, which works for the ruling bureaucracy just as the workers do. By reason of the class character of russian society and by reason of the different reproduction costs of labor power, the wages and salaries differ in the various occupations. The intellectuals are not better paid because they belong among the rulers, but because, in view of the fact that the market law continues to operate with reference to labor power, because wage labor still exists, the reproduction of labor power is not socially regulated but is left to the individuals. By the way, it ought to be known to Nomad that down until little over a year ago the russian state bureaucracy supported itself not so much upon the intellectuals as upon the skilled manual workers and was for this reason frequently dubbed a government of the "labor aristocracy". It is not until quite recently that the picture seems to be changing and the bureaucracy seems to be adapting itself more to the interests of the intelligentsia and peasants,at the expense of the labor aristocracy as well as of the workers in general. This change of front is not a voluntary one; it corresponds to the inevitably increasing internal and external difficulties as well as to the general tendency to the strengthening of private interests in Russia. It is at the same time the old capitalist policy, which by means of economico-political manoeuvers weighs more or less heavily upon the different social groups at different times, so long as this is objectively possible, in order that actual control may remain in the hands of the government.

To support his idea that all intellectuals are to be rated as an exploiting bureaucracy, in spite of the contradictions among themselves, Nomad refers to the fact that in capitalist countries, in spite of the opposition between the small and large capitals, all capitalists are united by a common interest against the workers. In this connection, however, he neglects to note that the at present privileged russian intellectuals are not in a position to exercise direct exploitation, but have to be content with what is allowed them by the ruling bureaucracy. They have no power of disposal over the productive apparatus, whereas the small capitalists in the private-economy countries, however much they may be controlled by the large concerns, still,as immediate owners of means of production, are direct participants in the exploitation of the workers. It is right here, of course, that we have the difference between state- and private-ownership capitalism, a difference which'Nomad carelessly overlooks when that is necessary for the defense of his theory.

Just as only a part of the intellectuals rises into the state bureaucracy, so it is only a still smaller part which sees matters in the way that Nomad conceives of them. What is Nomad's proof that "ever growing sections of the more enlightened part of the intelligentsia in non-fascist Europe and America are flocking now to the various marxist parties", that the "influence of the Communist Parties is now growing in France, Belgium, Spain, U.S.A., etc." (21) Wherever the "marxist" (?) parties are growing today, they are growing not as independent movements on the march to power, to state socialism, but by reason of the fact that they no longer possess such ambitions, that they are restricting themselves to obtaining flunkey jobs to perform for private capital. That is quite well known to Nomad himself, as shown by the following passage (26): "If a large part of the intellectuals in various countries, instead of turning socialist or communist, joins the fascist ranks,....it is their desire for a short cut to power that is responsible for the success of the new gospel. Many of the fascist intellectuals would join the communist movement if they saw that it had any chances, or at least intentions, of winning immediately. For by now it has become obvious to most observers that the leading Communists of the non-fascist countries have ceased to be revolutionaries at all; that ever since 1923 they have become ordinary Russian patriots abroad. Like the socialists of pre-War times, the Communists - meaning of course the official leadership - have become a party of anti-capitalist protest and not of anti-capitalist revolt."

Hence, according to Nomad, the communist parties are growing because "ever growing sections of the more enlightened part of the intelligentsia . . . see in the Russian example the possibility of putting an end to their economic insecurity, the hope of throwing off the financial magnates, and the prospect of becoming masters of the country themselves," (21) although it should, after all, be clear to this "more enlightened part of the intelligentsia" that "the leading communists have ceased to be revolutionaries at all". According to Nomad, then, the C.P. is growing because it is state-capitalist and because it is not so, because it is striving for intellectualist rule and also because it is not; according to Nomad it constantly does what it ought to do in conformity with Nomad's theories, even though in reality it does something quite different.

In countries which rate as backward from the point of view of objective ripeness for the proletarian revolution, the influence of the communist parties has recently increased as a result of the deepening of the crisis, while in those countries which have attained this objective ripeness, their influence has already sunk to something approaching zero, <u>just because they did not seize the power, because they did not even strive for power</u>; or because they simply did not pursue the plans which Nomad tries to ascribe to them. They simply refused to become the "Masters of Tomorrow". That these elements, in the course of a proletarian revolution directed <u>against them as well as against the bourgeoisie</u>, will attempt to divert it into state capitalism does not affect the fact that they themselves are no longer doing anything for the success of a state-capitalist revolution. The intellectuals have now acquired a greater degree of interest in the C.P., just as they once did in the S.P., because it has ceased to pursue any state socialist plans and thereby improved its chances of becoming <u>even today</u> a legal mass-party with a lot of jobs to dispense. Even though individual intellectuals are taking up with state-capitalist dreams, still the growth of the communist parties is not determined by these illusionists, but by the petty vermin that wants to arrange itself somehow in the present-day world and wants to be something even today.

Fascism attracts the intellectuals because it takes an outspokenly small-capitalist position, because it wants to defend "creative" capital against the "financiers", altho it is after all compelled to do the very opposite, simply because there is nothing else to be done. The circumstance that the fascist as well as the communist movement embraces people who dream of state capitalism

does not affect the fact that the whole fascist movement has a pronouncedly private-capitalist orientation, even though it can nevertheless only subscribe to monopoly capital. Nomad's calling up of the interesting bedtime story of the concealed designs of Mussolini to become the italian Lenin can hardly serve as proof of the "bolshevist" designs of the Fascists. Even before the founding of the fascist organizations, Mussolini had already sold himself to the italian capitalists. (Cf. A.Balabanoff's "Als der Duce noch nicht Duce War", Sozialistische Warte, March-April-May 1936; or, for that matter, Nomad's biography of Mussolini in "Rebels and Renegades".) Nomad may let himself be deluded by the capitalist tendencies to concentration and centralization, and wherever these tendencies operate, he may smell forthwith the state capitalism of the intellectuals; still this confusion of appearance with reality cannot affect the fact that these tendencies operate quite independently of the fascist or bolshevist parties and come forth quite as vigorously in countries without such parties as in those countries where they represent great mass movements.

In order to swell his material, Nomad is fond of throwing times and concepts together pell mell. Thus he writes on page 22 with reference to the capitalist war economy and the russian collectivization, conceiving both as conscious attempts at planning: "In both cases the economic interests of the acting classes involved was the driving force, which is what you call the human factor, and not the 'objective' or 'extra-human' element of the growth of the social forces of production." In reality, however, these measures were imposed upon their "initiators" by the force of circumstances. Neither the war nor its economy, any more than the collectivization, was in conformity with the economic interests of the capitalists, or with those of the russian bureaucracy, as the case may be. War diminishes surplus value, the collectivization strengthens the forces directed against the bureaucracy; and yet the "initiators" of this economic policy are forced to take it up without regard to their own economic interests. Every exploiting society is subject to the contradiction that in safeguarding its immediate interests its further interests are extensively damaged; which is simply a manifestation of the power of the objective elements over the subjective.

In exploitation relations, the more "planning" is done, the greater the chaos. And to denote the magnification of the oppositions and difficulties as an "element of conscious planning" can only occur to a person who has remained stuck in the bourgeois ideology. And it is also only on the basis of this bourgeois ideology that

attempts can be made to answer the question of the intellectualist rule of tomorrow with examples from the past. What was possible in feudal China and in the Paraguay of the 18th century does not and cannot demonstrate the future possibility for the intellectuals of setting up their neo-feudal rule notwithstanding the existence of the industrial proletariat.

Even though it may be "simply amazing" for Nomad to hear that in our conception the intellectuals have no economic functions, his amazement originates from his incapacity to distinguish between economic factors and those of a technico-organizational character. The capitalistic functions which his intellectuals have taken over or will take over from the capitalists are not appraised as economic. Of course, the bourgeoisie frequently employs the concept of economy even with reference to the culinary skill of their housewives; however, when we speak of economic functions, we use the word 'economic' in the sense of social, and do not mean the capacity to operate a factory or to manage a business establishment. Neither the capitalists nor the intellectuals fulfill economic functions; the thing is simply impossible, for under capitalism, the economy is regulated by way of the market, and otherwise it would not be capitalism. The natural necessity of bringing human consumption into such harmony with production that the society can continue to exist--and this constitutes the economy--is not consciously directed under capitalism,but takes the round-about course of the market, in which the process operates blindly.

Nomad's argument that the fascists are to be regarded as "major partners" of Capital for the very reason that they "are swallowing up an ever growing share of the Nation's wealth" is perhaps sufficiently disposed of with a mere reference to the fact that all countries, inclusive of the non-fascist ones, need an ever growing share of the surplus value for governmental purposes. And this is explained by the fact that, with the concentration of capital, the functions of the governments become more and more extensive and the imperialist character of capital makes necessary an ever more imposing array of instruments of power, as well as the fact that the general chaos, which is constantly growing greater by reason of the crisis, places ever greater demands upon the governing machinery, - and all this quite apart from the problems of the fascist movement.

Nor can Nomad's reference to the "anti-capitalist gestures" of the italian fascists be accepted as proof of the correctness of his ideas, for these "social-political" factors are not at all "anti-capitalist", but are capitalist necessities. That is to say, that these wage-

increases and shorter hours are needed by Capital, so long as the thing is objectively possible, and are introduced for the most various reasons: for example, in order still further to break the competitive capacity of the small capitals in the interest of the large concerns, or in order to offset the increased intensity of the labor process and to enable the necessary reproduction of labor power, and likewise in the interest of social security, since an industrial proletariat can simply not, in the long run, be treated like slaves or serfs. This social policy is not out of harmony with the fact of the sharpened exploitation of the workers; it is rather a manifestation of this latter, revealing that Capital has been successful in raising the degree of exploitation. So that in spite of the fascist "social policy", the situation of the italian workers has not been improved, but worsened, while italian capital has increased its profits in accordance with this worsening . Any objective work on the italian development since Mussolini's seizure of power will teach Nomad that he talks nonsense when he asserts that the fascists proceeded against Capital in order to further the interests of the workers and thereby to conform to their own bureaucratic necessities. In general, Nomad should be more careful about the choice of his "proofs". It is simply impossible--to take another instance--to maintain that "the Japanese officers' caste" (25) has independent disposal over Manchuria. A single glance at the capital investments in Manchuria would have taught him better. And even though half these capital investments are made by the japanese government itself, still the japanese government can hardly be claimed to be identical with Nomad's fascist officers' caste, but with japanese capital and large landed property; a circumstance that finds expression, according to Nomad himself, in the fact that his officers "are in the habit of 'bumping off' from time to time the most prominent representatives" of the japanese ruling class.

On page 26 Nomad attempts to identify our conception regarding fascism with that of the Stalinists. We had not, however, as Nomad will have it, asserted that fascism has been created by "the necessity of saving the capitalist system either from the proletarian menace or from the internal weakness." We said rather that "it was precisely the impossibility of further capitalist concessions to the other strata of the population which compelled the capitalists to set up and support a bureaucratic dictatorship which stands at their exclusive disposal" (26). The direct control of monopoly capital over the other social strata precluded the continuance of democratic parliamentarism. Fascism directed itself not against a menacing revolution, but against the reformist activity of the labor movement within the frame-

work of bourgeois democracy. From the external point of view, fascism arose from the necessity of strengthening the imperialist potentialities. The economic concentration had to be followed by the political. The middle-class movement, for which the crisis had furnished the impetus, was put to use by Capital for the purpose of breaking the reformistically organized resistance of the proletariat to its further impoverishment. True, the middle class represented in the fascist movement its specific interests; but since these are directed against the workers as well as against monopoly capital, and since accordingly a choice has to be made, it could only proceed with monopoly capital, and not against it. This situation was put to use by monopoly capital and with the aid of fascism it succeeded in creating the preconditions for a further relatively frictionless impoverishment of the proletariat and at the same time in greatly furthering the imperialist potentialities without resistance on the part of the workers. A part of the middle class received the positions of the ousted labor bureaucracy, whereby also the solidarity of interests of the middle class was broken. With the aid of this new bureaucracy monopoly capital now controls all the other social groups. Just as previously the labor bureaucracy had to turn against the interests of its partisans, so also the fascist bureaucracy has to turn against its middle-class partisans; for the interests of monopoly capital cannot be impaired without bringing into question the whole of exploitation society. The role which is played in present-day capitalist society by the large capitals is too considerable for their existence to be brought into question. To speak of present-day fascism as an intellectualist rule is rank nonsense.

Fascism is the dictatorship of Capital in the industrial countries under the economic crisis. One cannot denominate as fascism any dictatorship without distinction. When Nomad says that fascist dictatorships rule even in "more or less undeveloped Balkan or Latin-American" countries, he fails to consider that the relatively recent concept of Fascism has a quite determinate meaning and cannot be used for dictatorship generally. The czarist dictatorship was Czarism, and it does not occur to anyone to speak of the "Czar's Fascism". Hence when we speak of Fascism, we mean not something general, but something definite; we mean <u>the dictatorship of Capital in contrast to capitalist democracy</u>. Confusion of concepts, of which Nomad makes use, can hardly take the place of proofs.

We are glad to take notice that Nomad finds his previous characterization of the intellectualist rule--"state capitalism", "state socialism" or "capitalism

without capitalists"--to be inadequate and now wants to replace these terms with that of "unequalitarian socialism". (28) It appears, that is, that he has meanwhile arrived with Henryk Grossmann (28) at the view that "capitalism no longer exists where there is only one owner, and the Russian State, that is, the bureaucracy, is only one sole firm, so to speak." Whatever Nomad or others may understand by Socialism or Communism, however much they may water and falsify concepts, so far as we ourselves are concerned, Communism still remains a state of affairs in which the workers themselves are the masters of the means of production, and State Capitalism the social condition in which the State stands over against the workers as the owner of the means of production just as the private capitalists did previously. That is simple and clear and needs no new formulations. -- But to come to Grossmann, whom Nomad likes to flaunt before our eyes.

We are not interested in Grossmann's sympathies for the U.S.S.R., since, with all respect for Grossmann's scientific achievement, we have still not ceased to think independently. As a matter of fact, however, what Nomad here presents as Grossmann's view, and which he then accepts as his own, proves either that Nomad can't read or that he is incapable of reproducing things as they are written down. Neither in the passage adduced by Nomad nor anywhere else does Grossmann say what Nomad here tries to impute to him. Grossmann does not concern himself in the least with the question of whether the hilferdingian "general cartel" is still capitalistic or already socialistic as being "only one sole firm", since to Grossmann this "general cartel" is quite inconceivable except as "a series of cartels of separate branches of production which exchange their products among each other". (Grossmann, Das Akkumulations-und Zusammenbruchsgesetz des kapitalistischen Systems, page 606). He says instead, in the passage adduced by Nomad: "Only one or the other is possible: either we have in the general cartel a 'regulated' economy, which then ceases to be capitalistic; or if it is capitalistic, then it cannot possibly be 'regulated'. For Hilferding involves himself in an inescapable logical contradiction when he quite eliminates exchange and nevertheless still speak of a "capitalist' mode of production." (Ib., page 610.) So that what Grossmann is here concerned with is not Nomad's question, whether "capitalism no longer exists where there is only one owner," but whether capitalism can exist without the exchange relation. And to Grossmann, as to us, the significance of the exchange relation is represented in the following passage: "The abolition of exchange means, at the same time, the abolition of wage labor. The capitalist mode of production resting on wage labor presupposes, surely, the existence of the

capital relation, that is, a relation in which labor power as a commodity is purchased on the market by the owners of the means of production. Where a commodity is exchanged on the market between the working class and the employing class, there must necessarily exist also exchange value. If Hilferding speaks of the disappearance of commodity exchange and of value--and he has to do so in order to arrive at his 'regulated' economy--then there is also no place for the exchange of the commodity 'labor power'; or in other words, this implies that the capital relation also, the capitalist mode of production, must necessarily disappear. What comes to take its place may be either an unveiled master-and-man relationship, as in the Middle Ages, or else a socialist communal economy." (Ib., page 611) Since wage labor prevails in Russia, there must also be in existence there, according to Grossmann, a capital relation. And, thus, with the existence of the wage and capital relation in Russia, a regulated economy there is out of the question. So that to us and to Marxism the russian "planned-economy" tendencies have nothing in common with a socialist planned economy, but are only the technico-organizational measures of monopoly capital carried to the extreme.

Nomad's false interpretation of Henryk Grossmann is matched by his exposition of marxist principles, in which connection he rejoices that others also (Stalin, Sorel, Hook) have found it necessary to stand Marx on his head. In the first place, we may say that socialism does not mean "primarily a change in the form of production, or in the ownership of the means of production" (29), as Nomad asserts, but signifies, according to Marx and also to us, the abolition of any and all property relation with respect to the means of production thru their socialization. The question of distribution is not for Marxism "a secondary matter",(29) as Nomad puts it, but is inseparably bound up with the form of production. With the change in the forms of production there change also the forms of distribution; nothing else in this respect is possible. Marx was not of the opinion, as Nomad writes, that "during the first phase of communism . . . there would be no equality of incomes", but Marx writes that by reason of the equal incomes the inequality will still continue to exist. Let us listen to Marx himself: "What we have to deal with here is a communist society, not as if it had developed on a basis of its own, but on the contrary as it emerges from capitalist society...The individual producer received back from society, with deductions, exactly what he gives. What he has given to society is his individual amount of labor. For example, the social working day consists of the sum of the individual hours of work. He receives from society a voucher that he has

contributed such and such quantity of work (after deductions from his work for the common fund) and draws thru this voucher on the social storehouse as much of the means of consumption as the same quantity of work costs. The same amount of work which he has given to society in one form, he receives back in another.Here obviously the same principle prevails as that which regulates the exchange of commodities, so far as this exchange is of equal values, i.e. equal quantities of labor in one form are exchanged for equal quantities of labor in another form. The right of the producers is proportional to the amount of labor they contribute; the equality consists in the fact that everything is measured by an equal measure, labor, . . . and labor, to serve as a measure, must be defined by its duration or intensity; otherwise it ceases to be a standard measure. This equal right is an unequal right for unequal work; it tacitly recognizes unequal individual endowment, and thus capacities for production, as natural privileges. Right can by its very nature only consist in the application of an equal standard, but unequal individuals are only measurable by an equal standard insofar as they can be brought under an equal observation, be regarded from one definite aspect only, e.g. in the case under review, they must be considered only as workers and nothing more be seen in them, everything else being ignored. Further, one worker is married, another single, one has more children than another, and so on. Given an equal capacity for labor and thence an equal share in the funds for social consumption, the one will in practice receive more than the other, the one will be richer than the other,and so forth. To avoid all these inconveniences right must be unequal instead of being equal. But these deficiencies are unavoidable in the first phase of communist society." (Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program, pages 29-31).

So that Marx says exactly the opposite of what Nomad, like others previously,would like to read from him. For the very reason that the incomes are the same,whereas the individual conditions of the different workers are dissimilar, it is nonsense to speak of the removal of all inequality. Any other equality than that of incomes cannot exist in this phase of communism, as otherwise the "application of an equal standard" would be precluded, which in this first phase of communism is still necessary. Nor do the disquisitions in the Critique of the Gotha Program stand alone in this respect, but in the closest relation with the general standpoint of Marxism. Our interpretation, not that of Nomad, is confirmed by a great number of passages of "Capital", of Engels' "Anti-Duehring", etc. No other than our interpretation can be brought into harmony with the marxian doctrine of value. In Marx's writings, the higher is distinguished

from the lower phase of communism precisely in virtue of the fact that in this higher phase the principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" can be actualized, whereby it becomes possible to dispense with the narrow legal standpoint of equal incomes in spite of the unequal conditions of the individuals. While in the first phase of communism each worker receives for the same labor time, assuming equal intensity of labor (in case of relatively harder labor, shorter hours), the same income, since he is regarded only as a worker and nothing else, later on any standard of this sort is dispensed with, since society is able to leave this narrow legal foundation. If Nomad had made himself a bit more familiar with the communist laws of production, he would have been in a position to arrive at a better understanding of Marx's disquisitions and he might also have spared himself the silly question "who is to determine a man's needs?" Nomad is incapable of conceiving an independent human being. It might be stated, however, that even if people lack the capacity for anything further, there can after all hardly be any doubt that they are in a position to "determine their needs"; at any rate, we have never yet met anyone who did not know what he wanted.

Nomad does not limit himself, however, to turning the views of other people upside down; he is also not averse to distorting reality itself in conformity with his own ideas. In order to controvert our view that even in the alleged "planned economy" of state capitalism no improvement of the situation of the working class is possible,- that here also the capitalist tendency to crisis, even though modified, continues to exist--he asserts: "Even that one per cent of planned economy which was instituted by the New Dealers has undoubtedly improved the situation of large sections of the working class and won the sympathies of the masses for President Roosevelt". (30) In the first place, it is not permissible here to speak vaguely of "large sections" and perhaps attempt to maintain one's thesis with a reference to the shabby "public works" of the Roosevelt Administration, since of course we constantly speak of the working class as a whole; and secondly, what is Nomad's proof for his bold assertion? A single glance at the statistics would have shown him how badly he is mistaken. He would see that since the installation of the Roosevelt regime, the share of the workers in the social product has become not larger, but smaller; that the situation of the workers has been worsened, notwithstanding the slight upturn of quite recent date, which is not even attributable to Roosevelt's one-percent "planned economy", but to the inflation and the further rationalization, insofar as it is not bound up with the temporary spurt in production as a natural result of many years of depression.

The April 1936 official figures of the general business indexes published by the Federal Reserve authorities show that the volume of industrial production was 12 percent below the normal level (#). The value of all construction contracts was 58 percent below normal, while that of residential contracts was 74 percent below normal. Factory employment in April 1936 was on this same basis 25 percent below normal, while factory payrolls were 31 percent under normal, and department store sales 28 percent below. Ponder this: The volume of industrial production is 12 percent, factory employment 25 percent, and factory payrolls 31 percent below normal. In view of the differences between these three figures, Nomad's talk of the improvement of conditions as a result of Roosevelt's one-percent "planned economy" is revealed as nonsense. The circumstance that the masses nevertheless stand enthusiastically behind Roosevelt is not to be wondered at, for the government and the bourgeois propaganda machine are, of course, on hand for the purpose of making those masses tipsy. The mass is enthusiastic not because it has obtained something, but because it is expecting something. In consideration of its own weakness, it sets its hopes upon a messiah. The mass enthusiasm for Roosevelt or Hitler springs, like its need of religion, not from its well-being, but from its misery.

Perhaps in order to show that the "intellectualist economy" is capable of improving the situation of the workers and hence also capable of assuring its rule for an unlimited time, Nomad will also present us with the rising wage figures of Russia. In case he does, we should like to ask him not to content himself,like the russian intellectuals, with the wage figures alone,but also to let us have at the same time the price changes. Further still, the figures regarding the development of the productivity of labor...With all these figures in mind, he himself cannot help noting that in spite of the rising russian wages, the situation of the workers has worsened with increasing accumulation. For the past year it has already become necessary in Russia to impoverish the working population not only relatively to the mounting production, but also absolutely; the disproportion between prices and wages has already led to an actual wage cut, a matter which Nomad probably knows as well as we.

Now that we have seen how Nomad can expound texts in his own interest and represent reality as he would like to have it in order not to upset his theory,it will not

---

(#) The general business indexes are stated in terms which take their averages for the years 1923-25 as being equal to 100,

be surprising to hear that he can also predict in accordance with these theories our own future. Our position on the question of the intellectuals, he writes, is determined by the fact that "criticism of the intelligentsia as the ruling class of the coming period of a socialized form of economy" is directed also against our own "ambitions for power". (31) And then he compares us with all the other groups which at one time or another have promised to serve the masses and nevertheless were only aiming at power for themselves. When we speak of Workers' Councils, Nomad sees nothing more than the propagandists of the council idea, not the councils themselves, of which he can form no other idea than the one which he has of the bourgeois leader-mass organizations. He knows nothing at all of the economic functions of the councils, but sees in them only another party. For this reason he fails to realize how ridiculous he makes himself in referring to the russian soviets as an indication of our own future. The russian soviets were not "holding out the promise of 'withering away' of the State", as Nomad imagines (32). The soviets and the bolshevist state apparatus stood over against each other as separate organizations from the very beginning of the russian revolution, the state apparatus seeing in the soviets only an instrument for the carrying out of its resolutions. With the extension of the state apparatus and the concentration of all power in the hands of the bureaucracy, the soviets were dismantled, until today they have declined to nothing more than an empty decoration of no more significance than Hitler's "Labor Front". It was the State, i.e. the Party, that promised to "wither away"; the soviets could promise nothing of the sort. Even though the State was able to come into existence only by means of the soviets, i.e. of the russian revolution, still under the russian conditions the bureaucracy was soon in a position to deprive the soviets of all power. To us the councils or soviets are not instruments of the revolution with which the party works, but they are the basis of the dictatorship as well as of communist production. They cannot "wither away", nor have they any state beside themselves which could do likewise. They cannot promise that their "State" will vanish, for there is here no longer a State in the sense of the bourgeoisie or of the Bolsheviks. Their own state functions, i.e. the suppression of all capitalist forces, become superfluous with the success of that endeavor and thereby vanish. But the councils as the organization of the communist economy remain in existence. There is no special State by the side of them.

Taking as his text the brief presentation of our conception of communist society contained in one number of the Council Correspondence, Nomad tries to demonstrate

that we merely use other names in promising and aiming at the same thing as all previous labor organizations. The fact simply is that as a special group we promise nothing at all: to us the revolution and what comes after it is an affair of the class, which can promise nothing to itself. It can at most do something,or omit doing something. As a part of the working class,we are pleased to cooperate in the class tasks, and it goes without saying that in this connection we will try to put across the conception for which we stand. However, our attitude is such as to preclude the possibility that we ourselves, as a special group, should occupy or strive for positions by the side of the class organizations. To that end we would first have to change our attitude and become a party. It would be only by way of the backward development to a party that we could be placed in a position to add another to the already existing labor bureaucracies. We hold it to be impossible henceforth, under the present conditions in the industrial countries, to develop a labor bureaucracy which would be able to operate against the class interests of the proletariat. The period of capitalist dictatorship preceding the revolutionary uprising precludes the forming of organizations which would be capable of holding the revolution to certain paths in conformity with their desires. Whether in the process of the revolution itself, organizations will be formed by which the previously forming councils will again be destroyed is very questionable, even if not precluded. Still, just because this possibility exists, it is all the more necessary to insist on the exclusive rule of the councils. If reactionary forces should succeed in emasculating the councils, it is thereby also precluded that the workers' situation would be improved. The revolution is in that case only temporarily brought to a standstill; it will have to arise anew. In the last instance, the councils must after all assert themselves, for they alone are capable of actualizing communism,and only this latter is capable of doing justice to the needs of the masses.

According to Nomad, however, even then nothing is yet attained; for as he sees it,the councils will then do the same thing as the state capitalist parties attempted previously. And he tries to prove it to us with our own words. Since we speak of the necessity of centralism he writes that this "necessary centralism actually does away with the means of production in the hands of the producers,....is nothing but our good old Bolshevik state bureaucracy". (33) It would lead too far to explain to Nomad at this place the process of communist economy. It might be stated here, however, that there are all sorts of centralism, and not centralism without qualification. The technico-centralistic management of

large industrial concerns is something different from the capitalistic centralization of power in the hands of a few capitalists. The authority of the technico-organizational central apparatus extends only to the technico-organizational matters of the concern; it is subject to the control of the actual owners of these concerns. The technico-organizational and the economico-political centralization may, as in Russia, be largely combined; here the planning commission operates in harmony with the government, or carries out its desires. Not every centralism, however, signifies actual power over society. Whether the central control of production and distribution is at the same time centralization of power, or only a technical function and nothing more, depends on the whole complex of social conditions. A central planning commission alone has no power over the producers; in order to have that, it has to have also at its disposal material means for putting thru its plans even against the producers' will. That is to say that in order to impose its own will, it must have by the side of itself a state apparatus. It is not the central planning commission in Russia which can exercise dictatorship, but only the State with its police, soldiery, etc. Without this special state apparatus, not subject to the control of the producers, the centralization of economic activity is void of all authority; it can fulfill only technical functions, no economico-political ones. When there is no special State beside the councils, when the armed enterprises represent the one and only actual social power, then the central organization itself is reduced to a mere enterprise, to a clearing house, of no greater importance than any other enterprise. Nomad's incapacity to distinguish between technical and economic matters trips him up in his consideration of communism quite as fatally as before in his consideration of the functions of the intellectuals under capitalism. Incidentally, it might be stated that Nomad need not lose any sleep over the fate of the unemployed. It is not at all the bureaucracy that "will have to tackle the problem of reorganizing the industries".(33) As previously, so also under communism, industry can be reorganized only by industry itself. The enterprises are quite capable of taking on workers; they are in no need, to that end, of the orders of Nomad's intellectuals, who ordinarily know as much about the enterprises as a tapeworm does about sunlight.

And now a word regarding that "very suspicious passage"; namely, our statement that "equality must not only be actually possible; it must also be capable of driving forward the productive forces of society". That was by no means intended "artfully" with a view to later justification of inequality on the ground of the un-

ripeness of the situation. Of course, we too are aware that between theory and practice a complete agreement is not always immediately possible and that the organization of the communist society also will be faced with great difficulties; yet for that very reason, the theory must be represented all the more consistently. Whether communism, as we see it, will be actually capable of complete realization "on the morrow after the revolution" is a question which we pass over as idle speculation. We know that any reorganization of society is a long and painful process; but we know also that this process can only be shortened when one takes part in it as if the "morrow after the revolution" were going to find the complete communism in operation. The more consistently the revolutionists proceed, the greater the success. Just as today we adjust our policy to the overthrow of Capital, altho Capital is still sitting tight in the saddle, so also we have adjusted our policy to the immediate complete realization of communism, without regard for the fact that the process will probably be a tedious struggle. However, when we said that "equality must also be capable of driving forward the productive forces of society", what we had in mind was nothing of the sort that Nomad terms "suspicious". On the contrary: since we are convinced that even today in the industrially developed countries only equality, communism, is capable of driving forward the productive forces, we wished here to give expression to the idea that in such countries only communist revolutions are possible. Marx welcomed the development of capitalism as a development of the social forces of production and this development was bound up with the existence of classes, was the horribly bloody process of the creation of the proletariat and of industry. No equality was here possible; equality would not have been able to develop the productive forces in the measure in which capitalism was able to do so. The development of the productive forces at a certain stage of the development of human society is bound up with inequality. Inequality is here progressive. Equality in backward Russia, for example, with but little industry and an infinitesimal minority of proletarians, would never have been able to develop the productive forces in such measure as has been possible under the inequality of the bolshevist-capitalist dictatorship. The Bolshevists, like Capital in other countries, were progressive because they promoted not equality but inequality, even though by reason of this they became a reactionary force with respect to the international revolution. An exploiting society is objectively revolutionary when this exploitation is identical with the development of the productive forces. It is not until it stands in the way of the development of those productive forces that it becomes objectively reactionary. To renounce the ex-

ploitation of the russian workers would be for Russia objectively reactionary; the inequality and exploitation has called forth industry and produced the proletariat, forces which today announce the coming in Russia of the communist revolution. Our point of departure is constantly the industrial proletariat in countries where the bourgeoisie is compelled to restrict the productive forces. Only such a proletariat, in such countries, is in a position, by means of communist equality, to drive forward the productive forces.

When we further said that with the setting aside of the class relations "there vanish also the sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions", we meant exactly what we said; not what Nomad tries hard to understand by it, "that there will be different income levels, but that these differences will not be very sharp" (34). The sharp distinctions in the evaluation of the various labor functions vanish precisely because of the equal incomes. An engineer will not feel so far removed from a manual worker when both have the same incomes; for it is not so much the occupation by which people are separated, but the various incomes to which those occupations give rise.

We do not regard it as possible to convince Nomad of what any other serious work on the subject would tell him, namely, that there has unmistakably been bound up with the development of the productive forces a leveling up of the intelligence of the various social strata, and that with the further development of the productive forces this process is bound to go on, the one being inseparable from the other. The intelligence of the workers is not dissociated from society even when their activity is restricted to the performance of a manipulation, since the decisive thing here is not the manipulation but the state of society as a whole. Such things, which are understandable forthwith to any reflecting humanbeing, we do not consider it possible to make clear to Nomad because his conviction of proletarian helotism is too hidebound to be shaken. "Ninety-nine out of a hundred (workers)," he writes (36), "understand absolutely nothing of the complicated business of running a highly involved social system of the machine age,"; without the faintest suspicion that he is here merely giving expression to his own incapacity. When we assert that the working class is in a position, without and if necessary against the intellectuals, to conduct their society, Nomad sees nothing more than shabby demagogy which flatters the workers in order to win them.

The workers, according to Nomad, are incapable of anything, but he finds that society can be conducted very

well by Heinz Neumann's "Lumpenproletarians" and the "similar group of declasse intellectuals and semi-intellectuals who seized all the power in Russia" (27). What the workers can not do, altho they are practically the masters of all production, that can be done quite well, according to Nomad, by the "outs", "the unemployed or underpaid journalists, lecturers, college graduates and under-graduates, lawyers without clients and doctors without patients, educated ex-workers in search of a white collar position," etc., etc. (18). And accordingly Nomad's struggle against this intellectual rabble cannot be taken seriously. For if the workers themselves are not in a position to take over production today, they will not be capable of doing so tomorrow either; if the intellectuals have or obtain a monopoly on the control and direction of production, they will also know how to make this monopoly permanent. That, however, could only be welcomed, according to Nomad's theory, since the intellectuals have become a blessing to the workers: without them the workers would have to go hungry, since they themselves are, of course, incapable of directing production. And so the workers would be obliged, in their own interest, to further the ambitions of the intellectuals, instead of turning against them, for the existence and the success of the intellectuals is the condition precedent to their own existence and their own success. What Heinz Neumann still spoke of as the "Lumpenproletariat" has meanwhile become for Nomad the light of humanity. True it is only in their own interest that the intellectuals are the workers' benefactors, since they make use of the workers in the struggle against the old capitalists; but still their success is in line with the workers' most immediate interests, since they must offer the workers more than these latter receive from the private capitalists. So that Nomad is then quite consistent in saying that it is very much a matter of indifference which of the existing labor organizations the workers join, since "each of these organizations, in its endeavor to win the workers, is bound to help them in obtaining higher wages, shorter hours, etc." (41). And since, according to Nomad, this is and must be done also by the Fascists, we really fail to see why they too should not be favored with working-class support.

In all this, Nomad never once stops to ask himself whether what he asserts is in harmony with the facts or, if so, is permanently possible. As a matter of fact, political parties and trade unions have long assured their existence by helping to make possible any improvement in the workers' situation. It is solely for this reason, of course, that the history of the old labor movement has become a history of labor

fakery. The fact that these organizations, just like the whole of bourgeois society, of which they are a part, have had to be both revolutionary and reactionary, helpful to the workers at one time and injurious at another--this temporal factor Nomad has quite overlooked. It reality, it is only in quite determinate historical conditions that these organizations are able to "do something for the workers", while under other historical conditions they are obliged to operate against the workers' interests, whether they want to or not. What Nomad has to demonstrate is that these organizations are <u>today</u> in a position to become the workers' "benefactors"; but that is simply not demonstrable.

But to come back to the assertion that the intellectuals are capable while the workers are not, of directing production. In the first place, here again we meet with the confusion of technical with economic matters. For as yet the intellectuals have performed no social-economic functions; they still leave these to the market, not only in private-capitalist countries but also, in a somewhat more organized form, in Russia. And as concerns their technical functions, Nomad attaches to them excessive importance. If he had but a faint idea of modern enterprises, or if he could see the modern industrial proletariat as it actually is, it would become clear to him that this proletariat is quite in a position to manage production. This management is also a function to which may be applied the statement which Nomad relates exclusively to ordinary manual tasks; it "can be learned in a few days or weeks" (35). Incidentally, the greater part of the present-day intellectual functions is not devoted to production, but to activities which are necessary only in a profit economy, while in a communist society they drop out.

Furthermore, of course, it is not at all necessary that the workers themselves perform all indispensable intellectual functions forthwith. All that is necessary is that they have charge of the enterprises, for thereby they have control also over the intellectuals. Enterprises are not mastered with intellectuals, but with arms. They are mastered thru economic measures which preclude the arising of special organs of power by the side of the workers' councils. They are mastered also by reason of the fact of our constituting the majority, which counts when it is not opposed by any special political apparatus of power. With the mastery of the workers over the enterprises and thereby over production and distribution, nothing remains to the intellectuals but to place themselves at the disposition of the working population. They are obliged to take their places in the economic system determined by the workers, or they have to go hungry. Who, then, would

continue to doubt that a part of the intellectuals necessary for production, in early recognition of the consequences of the altered situation, will take their places willingly in the new order, and thereby isolate and render still more powerless the part whose attitude toward this order is still unsympathetic. Under communist conditions, the intellectuals will no more be in a position to exist outside society than they are today. If they want to live, they have no choice but to work together with the workers in the enterprises.

We have here been obliged to speak from the standpoint of Nomad's argumentation, altho it would have been much simpler and more enlightening to deal with this problem without regard to Nomad, from the standpoint of Marxism. Only a further word in conclusion: Just as there is no theory, however false, which does not contain also a grain of truth, so also Nomad's theory is based upon a partial truth. Since class oppositions exist under capitalism and state capitalism, and since the intellectual professions are for the most part exercised by elements of the middle class, the opposition between middle class and proletariat, between middle class and capital is manifested also as an opposition between intellectuals and workers, or intellectuals and capitalists. From one of a number of phases of these class oppositions, Nomad constructs the eternal opposition between intellectual and manual activity. History ceases to be a history of class struggles; it becomes a struggle between the educated and those on the way to becoming so for the mastery over the ignorant; a state of affairs to which Nomad applies the name of permanent revolution. Yet, in this competitive struggle between the educated or relatively educated, the ignorant also are continually gaining, since in order to get the support of these latter the competing group is obliged to have more to offer them than has the intellectual element in power at the time. Thus the salvation of humanity lies in this competitive struggle of the intellectuals, and thus things will slowly become better also for the less educated , so that they themselves will naturally become more and more enlightened. And all that in complete independence of the economic problems of society and its transformations. If, however, we think Nomad's theory of the "permanent revolution" consistently to its end, we can come to no other conclusion than that here also, where the situation of the workers keeps on improving, a point must of necessity be reached at which equality is established and the opposition between intellectuals and workers has wholly disappeared; and hence there disappears also Nomad's permanent revolution, which now, after all, like all other socialist theories, has its "final". But even

tho Nomad himself may like to split his head over the question of how he arrived at a permanent revolution without permanency, our attention continues to be directed to the more important problems of the class struggle between Capital and Labor. -P.M.-

#####"#"##"#####

To ALL THE WORKERS IN THE WORLD

Fellow workers,proletarians, workers of the world at large: Where are you? Where is your social and class consciousness when you permit the governments directing the destinies of your countries to support, by their non-intervention in the Spanish civil war, the military fascists that rose in arms in defense of privilege and capital.

Fellow anarchists and communists, syndicalists, socialists and trade-unionists: The hour of liberation for Spain has struck.The working class of the Iberian peninsula turns to you for help.In the defense of an ideal which is also your ideal,they are shedding their blood on the battlefields,convinced that you,fellow workers of the world, will respond adequately to their heroic sacrifice. Your governments have refused aid to the Spanish government that was elected by the people, but you are not the official STATE,you are not a bourgeois power, you are WORKERS, you are our BROTHERS and you cannot permit that such refusal be carried out while other nations give their open support to the enemies of the Spanish working class.

Arise,proletarians! Fight the evil designs of your governments!Send us arms and munitions to enable us to fight and crush the hangmen of the Spanish people;for they are your enemies just as much as they are ours.

If it is true that you are intimately interested in the bloody struggle that we are carrying on against the military-fascist uprising,if you feel an ardent desire for the freedom of the working class,do not hesitate and come to our help immediately. Your fellow workers in Spain require from you that support which your governments have denied Spain.There is not and there should be no other diplomacy among workers than that of doing their duty. Your duty, comrades and fellow workers throughout the world, is not to permit the fascists and their allies to crush us.

THE NATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF LABOR
THE IBERIAN ANARCHIST FEDERATION

The "Popular Front" and Fascism

A manifesto issued by the Communist Party of Italy and published in the "Imprecor" (#38),the official Press Correspondence of the Communist International,states:

" Only the brotherly union of the people of Italy brought about by the reconciliation of Fascists and non-Fascists will be in a position to break down the power of the bloodsuckers in our country."

"Let us reach out our hands to each other,children of the Italien nation,Fascists and Communists,Catholics and Socialists,people of all opinions,and let us march side by side to enforce the right of existence of a civilised country,as ours is. We have the same ambition -to make Italy strong,free and happy."

"Workers and intellectuals,Socialists,Democrats,Liberals,Catholics! Use all your endeavours for the reconciliation and unity of the Italian people,for the creation of a People's Front in Italy.The present rulers of Italy wish to keep the Italian people split into Fascists and non-Fascists.Let us raise high the banner of unity of the people for bread,work, liberty and peace!

" We proclaim that we are prepared to fight,together with you and the whole Italian people,for the carrying out of the Fascist programme of 1919 and for every demand which represents a particular or general and immediate interest of the workers and the people of Italy." The C.P. --Mussolinis most loyal Opposition.

;;::::::::::::

Democracy in Russia

"The 16 prisoners, accused of conspiracy to murder Stalin,were sentenced to death at 2.30 a.m.,August 24. They were convicted on the evidence of their own confessions, obtained from them by the Ogpu before the trial; and the Ogpu knows all the tricks of the third degree.Why did they not retract their confessions when in court? Broken fragments of manhood;hemmed in,as they were,by bayonets;torn between the fear of further torture and the last glimmer of hope of release-each individual had a promise that his life would be spared, on condition that he adhered to his confession.After the sentence,the 16 were not given much opportunity to withdraw their confessions;at dawn,August 25,it is officially reported,they were all shot,including the inevitable stool-pigeons. Why shoot the stool-pigeons? Dead men tell no tales. And why did Tomsky shoot himself? Not because he had plotted to kill Stalin,but because Stalin was plotting to kill Tomsky, after screwing out of him a false confession."
(F.W.Chandler in "Controversy" #1.)

Roosevelts Prosperity

The current monthly survey of business made public by the American Federation of Labor states that :

Profits of the larger corporations are approaching pre-depression levels, with profits for 330 large industria corporations for nine months of 1936 55.5 per cent above the corresponding period in 1935.

Dividend payments to stockholders of 492 companies increased 33 per cent in 1936 over 1935.

Productivity in many industries has been enormously increased due to speed-up methods and technolicical improvements.

In the automobile industry in 1936 gains in production per worker were double the wage gains.In the boot and shoe industry production per worker per houer has increased 10.5 per cent in 1936 as compared with 1935 while the worker's earnings per houer have actually decreased 3.5 per cent.

The rise in hourly earnings of wage earners has been ½ cent an hour in 1936 above the 1935 figure while the cost of living has gone up 3.3 per cent.So that the worker has actually received less for his hour's work in 1936 than he did in 1935.

The worker's weakly income,however, has increased more than hourly earnings because hours have been lengthened.The average work week in industry has been lengthened two hours in 1936,increasing from 38 to 40 hours and by thus adding to the work time of those already employed instead of taking on new workers,' industry has denied jobs to several thousand unemployed.

By working two hours longer and by receiving half a cent more per houer,workers . . have added $ 1.11 to their weekly pay,raising the average wage level from $21.35 to $ 23.53.This is a 5.5 per cent increase, somewhat more than the increase in cost of living so that the average weekly wage of 1936 will buy 3.1 per cent more than last year.

.....

READ:

Rätekorrespondenz,(theoretisches und Discussionsorgan für die Rätebewegung.Herausgegeben von der Gruppe Internationaler Kommunisten (Holland) 10¢
Order from :Council Correspondence, Chicago, Ill.
1237 N.California Ave.

New Essays

1935-1936

GREENWOOD